THE FRAGMENTS OF THE ROMAN HISTORIANS

Volume I

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL EDITOR

T. J. Cornell

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

E. H. Bispham, T. J. Cornell, J. W. Rich, C. J. Smith

CONTRIBUTORS

E. H. Bispham, J. Briscoe, T. J. Cornell, A. Drummond†, B. M. Levick, S. J. Northwood, S. P. Oakley, M. P. Pobjoy, J. W. Rich, C. J. Smith

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2013

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First published 2013

Impression: 2

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

ISBN 978–0–19–927703–2 (Vol. 1)
ISBN 978–0–19–927704–9 (Vol. 2)
ISBN 978–0–19–967906–5 (Vol. 3)
ISBN 978–0–19–927705–6 (Set)

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

PREFACE

This new edition of the fragments of the Roman historians is the result of a collaborative project conceived at a conference in London in 1996. Three of the participants, Ed Bispham, Simon Northwood, and Christopher Smith, came up with the idea, and persuaded me to undertake the direction of the project. Further members of the team were co-opted over the following months, and the first full meeting took place in Manchester in the spring of 1997. An editorial committee was formed, and a plan of operation was drawn up whereby individual members of the team undertook to compose entries for individual Roman historians. The completed entries were then circulated to the rest of the team for critical assessment and open discussion at subsequent meetings, which were held at regular intervals over the following years. During this time the dossier of completed entries filled up, and further allocations were made, until (after a much longer gestation period than had originally been envisaged) all were accounted for and completed. The same process was then adopted for the various sections of the General Introduction.

Each author entry in each of the three volumes, and each discrete section of the General Introduction, is therefore the work of a single member of the team, except in a minority of cases where two or more of us have collaborated to produce a joint entry. Authorship in each case is indicated in the Table of Contents for each volume by the initials of the relevant contributor(s). It should be noted, however, that all entries have been circulated to all members of the team, who have been invited to send comments and suggested revisions to the individual contributors, and to air their criticisms in open discussion at meetings; revised versions have then been circulated, sometimes more than once. The work is thus a collaborative product, and it must be stressed that each of us has contributed to a greater or lesser extent to every part. Inevitably we have had disagreements on the interpretation of individual texts and of linguistic, literary, and historical problems; but the final version of both the General Introduction and the author entries should be taken as the collective view of us all. For this reason all authorial statements in these volumes are expressed in the first person plural. One further point on which we are all agreed is that our preferred abbreviation for the title of this work is *FRHist*, partly to match Jacoby's *FGrHist*, and partly to differentiate it from *Die frühen römischen Historiker* by H. Beck and U. Walter (abbr. *FRH*).

As is to be expected in a longstanding project of this nature, we have incurred debts of all kinds. At our earliest meetings the basic costs (travel, accommodation, and subsistence) were met by small grants from the Arts Faculty of the University of Manchester, and subsequent meetings were funded in the same way by a series of small grants from the British Academy, which also funded two conferences on Roman historians. These took place at Lenton Hall, University of Nottingham, where we were able to present problems of dealing with fragmentary texts to a wider audience of scholars and postgraduate students. Our thanks are due to these bodies, and also to institutions that offered us the use of their premises for our meetings, including the Manchester Museum, Brasenose College, Oxford, the University of Nottingham, and the London Institute of Classical Studies. The award of a two-year Leverhulme Senior Fellowship in 2004–6 enabled me as General Editor to complete the main task of putting all the disparate entries together, ordering and revising them, and editing

them in a consistent house style. Without this generous grant *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* would never have seen the light of day, and as a consequence we are all indebted to the Leverhulme Trust.

Section 3 of the General Introduction (I. 19–38) is a revised and expanded version of John Briscoe's chapter in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (cf. p. xxvi), 53–72. We are grateful to the British Academy for permission to re-use it here.

Over the years we have received the active support and encouragement of friends and colleagues who have helped us by reading and commenting critically on parts of the work, by writing letters of support when we applied for grants, by sending us offprints and references to out-of-the-way publications, by contributing to discussions at our conferences, and in many other ways. Special mention in this connection may be made of Tony Woodman, who read large parts of the text and made numerous perceptive suggestions, and of Michael Crawford, who attended meetings at an early stage and gave us invaluable advice and the benefit of his experience in organizing collaborative projects. To them, and to others who have assisted us in innumerable acts of kindness and generosity, we are immensely grateful.

Thanks are also due to those who helped us in seeing the work through to Press, particularly to Margaret Cornell for assistance with the General Index, to the copy editor, Jeff New, and the proof reader, Catherine Macduff. The staff of Oxford University Press have been unfailingly helpful and courteous in the years since the possibility of a publishing contract was first raised, and have shown inexhaustible patience: we are greatly indebted to the Senior Commissioning Editor (Classics), Hilary O'Shea, to her assistant Taryn das Neves, and to the Production Editor, Kizzy Taylor-Richelieu.

As General Editor I am extremely grateful to my fellow contributors for all their hard work in preparing their contributions, for their help in scrutinizing and correcting the contributions of others, and for their constant friendship and support throughout the long gestation of this work. I should also like to extend special thanks to John Briscoe, with whom I have been privileged to share an office at the University of Manchester for the past five years, and whom I have subjected to a constant barrage of queries and requests for help, especially in the field of textual criticism; to John Rich, who has been an invaluable source of wisdom and advice on broad strategic issues and the question of how the work should be presented; and to Mark Pobjoy, who in the later stages of preparing the typescript for submission to the Press undertook a final edit of the second volume, correcting numerous errors and inconsistencies. The efforts of these colleagues have greatly improved the finished product, and we all owe them an immense debt.

Finally, it is my sad duty to record that one of our number, our dear friend and colleague Andrew Drummond, died after a long battle against cancer in the summer of 2010. During his last years, after taking early retirement on grounds of ill-health from his post at the University of Nottingham, he devoted himself selflessly to this project and the task of completing his entries on the historians of the late republic and early principate. The depth of his scholarship, the immense range of his knowledge, and the clarity of his thought are evident for all to see on every page that he contributed. These entries are a tribute to his memory, to which we have agreed to dedicate the work as a whole.

TIM CORNELL
September 2012

CONTENTS

VOLUME 1: INTRODUCTION

List of tables xx
List of contributors xxi
Abbreviations xxii
1. Journals and other serial publications xxii
2. Works of reference and other works cited by short title xxvi
3. Books and articles cited by author or author and short title xxix
4. Earlier editions of the fragments of the Roman historians xxxviii

Greek and Latin texts: abbreviations and editions (and additional sources of readings) xl

General Introduction

1. EARLIER EDITIONS (JWR) 4
2. THE PRESENT EDITION (TJC, JWR) 7
2.1 *Scope* 7
2.2 *Structure and contents* 11
2.3 *Testimonia and fragments: text and* apparatus criticus 12
2.4 *Testimonia* 13
2.5 *The fragments: verbatim and non-verbatim citations; identifying attributed material* 15
2.6 *The fragments: attribution to author, work, and book; ordering* 16

3. LANGUAGE AND STYLE OF THE FRAGMENTARY ROMAN HISTORIANS (JB) 19
3.1 *The nature of the evidence* 19
3.2 *Previous views* 20
3.3 *Archaisms and neologisms* 22
3.4 *Cato* 23
3.5 *L. Cassius Hemina, Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus, L. Calpurnius Piso* 25
3.6 *C. Fannius and Cn. Gellius* 26
3.7 *L. Coelius Antipater* 27
3.8 *Sempronius Asellio and the autobiographers* 28
3.9 *Q. Claudius Quadrigarius* 29
3.10 *Valerius Antias* 32
3.11 *L. Cornelius Sisenna* 33
3.12 *C. Licinius Macer* 34
3.13 *The historic present* 35
3.14 *Prose rhythm* 35
3.15 *Post-Sallustian writers* 36

4. THE CITING AUTHORITIES (EHB, JB, TJC, BML, SJN, JWR, CJS) 38

4.1 *Overview* (JWR) 38
4.2 *Individual sources*: 45
Appian (JWR) 45
Arnobius (TJC) 47
Asconius (EHB, TJC) 48
Bede (JB) 49
Cassius Dio (JWR) 50
Censorinus (TJC) 50
Charisius (JB, JWR) 52
Chronicon Paschale (JWR) 53
Cicero (EHB, TJC, JWR) 53
De dubiis nominibus (JB) 60
Diomedes (JB, JWR) 60
Dionysius of Halicarnassus (SJN) 61
Donatus (JB, JWR) 64
Eusebius (JWR) 64
Eutropius (JWR) 66
Festus (TJC) 67
Frontinus (TJC) 68
Fronto (JB) 69
Fulgentius (CJS) 69
Gellius (JB, JWR) 69
Hieronymus (St Jerome) (JWR) 73
Historia Augusta (TJC) 74
Isidore (JB, JWR) 80
Lactantius (CJS) 81
Livy (JB, JWR) 82
Lydus (TJC) 88
Macrobius (CJS, TJC, JWR) 89
Malalas (JWR) 90
Marius Victorinus (JB, JWR) 91
Minucius Felix (CJS) 91
Nonius Marcellus (JB, JWR) 92
Origo Gentis Romanae (CJS, TJC) 96
Orosius (JWR) 101
Pliny the Elder (CJS, TJC) 102
Plutarch (TJC) 105
Polybius (JWR) 113
Priscian (JB, JWR) 114
Probus (JB, JWR) 115
Quintilian (TJC) 115
Scholia (JB) 117
Scholia: Juvenal (JB) 117
Scholia: Lucan (JB) 117
Scholia: Virgil, *Bernensia* (JB, JWR) 117
Scholia: Virgil, *Veronensia* (JB, JWR) 117
Seneca the Elder (BML) 118
Seneca the Younger (BML) 119
Servius (JB, JWR) 119

Solinus (TJC) 122
Strabo (EHB, TJC) 124
Suetonius (TJC) 125
Syncellus (JWR) 129
Tacitus (BML) 130
Tertullian (CJS) 132
Valerius Maximus (JB, JWR) 134
Varro (TJC) 135
Velleius Paterculus (JWR) 136

Introductions to Individual Historians

Annales Maximi (JWR) 141
1. Q. Fabius Pictor (EHB, TJC) 160
2. L. Cincius Alimentus (EHB, TJC) 179
3. P. Cornelius Scipio Africani f. (JB) 184
4. A. Postumius Albinus (SJN) 185
5. M. Porcius Cato (TJC) 191
6. L. Cassius Hemina (JB) 219
7. C. Acilius (EHB, SJN) 224
8. Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (SJN) 227
9. L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (MPP) 230
10. C. Sempronius Tuditanus (CJS) 240
11. C. Sempronius Gracchus (JB) 243
12. C. Fannius (TJC) 244
13. Vennonius (SJN) 250
14. Cn. Gellius (JB) 252
15. L. Coelius Antipater (JB) 256
16. Paulus Clodius (JB) 264
17. Cn. Aufidius (CJS) 266
18. M. Aemilius Scaurus (CJS) 267
19. Q. Lutatius Catulus (CJS) 271
20. Sempronius Asellio (MPP) 274
21. P. Rutilius Rufus (CJS) 278
22. L. Cornelius Sulla (CJS) 282
23. L. Licinius Lucullus (CJS) 287
24. Q. Claudius Quadrigarius (JB) 288
25. Valerius Antias (JWR) 293
26. L. Cornelius Sisenna (JB) 305
27. C. Licinius Macer (SPO) 320
28. C. Piso (CJS) 332
29. M'. Otacilius Pitholaus (CJS) 333
30. L. Lucceius (AD) 335
31. Q. Hortensius Hortalus (AD) 338
32. Lutatius (CJS) 341
33. T. Pomponius Atticus (AD) 344

34. T. Ampius Balbus (CJS) 354
35. P. Licinius Apollonius (CJS) 355
36. L. Scribonius Libo (CJS) 356
37. Munatius Rufus (CJS, BML, TJC) 358
38. L. and Q. Aelius Tubero (SPO) 361
39. M. Tullius Cicero (AD) 368
40. C. Oppius (CJS, TJC) 380
41. L. Cornelius Balbus (CJS, TJC) 383
42. M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (AD) 385
43. M. Actorius Naso (CJS) 390
44. Tanusius Geminus (AD) 391
45. Cornelius Nepos (JB, AD) 395
46. M. Tullius Tiro (AD) 402
47. P. Volumnius (AD) 404
48. Octavius Ruso (CJS) 406
49. Calpurnius Bibulus (AD) 407
50. C. Furnius (CJS) 410
51. L. Ateius Philologus (CJS) 411
52. M. Terentius Varro (AD) 412
53. Q. Dellius (CJS) 424
54. Cornutus (BML) 426
55. Sulpicius Blitho (CJS) 429
56. C. Asinius Pollio (AD) 430
57. C. Sulpicius Galba (CJS) 446
58. L. Arruntius (BML) 448
59. M. Vipsanius Agrippa (CJS) 451
60. Imp. Caesar Augustus (CJS) 454
61. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (AD) 463
62. T. Labienus (TJC) 472
63. C. Julius Hyginus (BML, TJC) 474
64. C. Clodius Licinus (SPO) 482
65. Julius Marathus (CJS) 484
66. C. Drusus (CJS) 485
67. Aquilius Niger (CJS) 486
68. Julius Saturninus (CJS) 487
69. Alfius (CJS, TJC) 488
70. Fenestella (AD) 489
71. A. Cremutius Cordus (BML) 497
72. Bruttedius Niger (BML) 502
73. Ti. Claudius Nero (BML) 503
74. L.(?) Annaeus Seneca (Maior) (BML) 505
75. Claudius (BML, TJC) 509
76. Ti. Claudius Herma Sideropogon (JWR) 514
77. Agrippina (BML) 515
78. Aufidius Bassus (BML) 518
79. M. Servilius Nonianus (BML) 522

80. C. Plinius Secundus (BML) 525
81. P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus (BML) 535
82. Cn. Domitius Corbulo (BML) 538
83. C. Suetonius Paullinus (BML) 546
84. Cluvius Rufus (BML) 549
85. Imp. T. Flavius Vespasianus (BML) 561
86. Vipstanus Messalla (BML) 566
87. Fabius Rusticus (BML) 568
88. Q. Junius Arulenus Rusticus (BML) 573
89. Herennius Senecio (BML) 575
90. P.(?) Vibius Maximus (BML, TJC) 577
91. Ti. Claudius Pollio (BML) 579
92. Pompeius Saturninus (BML) 581
93. C. Fannius (BML) 582
94. C. Pompeius Planta (BML) 584
95. Cn. Octavius Titinius Capito (BML) 586
96. Imp. M. Ulpius Traianus (BML, TJC) 587
97. Imp. P. Aelius Hadrianus (BML) 590
98. Bruttius (BML, JWR) 593
99. Apuleius (TJC) 596
100. Imp. L. Septimius Severus (BML) 598
101. L.(?) Marius Maximus (BML, TJC) 602
102. Asinius Quadratus (BML, TJC) 612
103. Aemilius Sura (BML) 617
104. Domitius (CJS) 619
105. Egnatius (CJS) 621
106. Juventius Martialis (BML) 622
107. M. Octavius (CJS) 623
108. Rubellius Blandus (BML, TJC) 624
109. Anonymus 1 (JB) 626
110. Anonymus 2 (JB) 627

APPENDIX 1: Authors not included (in alphabetical order) 629
A1 Annaeus Seneca Minor, L. (BML) 629
A2 Annius Fetialis (CJS) 629
A3 Anteius Rufus, P. (BML) 630
A4 Antistius Vetus, L. (BML) 630
A5 Antoni[n]us Julianus (BML) 631
A6 Aquilius Regulus, M. (BML) 632
A7 Asconius Pedianus, Q. (BML) 632
A8 Aurunculeius Cotta, L. (CJS) 632
A9 Baebius Macer (CJS) 633
A10 Caecina, A. (BML) 633
A11 Casca (CJS) 634
A12 Claudius Balbillus, Ti. (BML) 634
A13 Cornelius Bocchus (JWR) 635
A14 Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, Cn. (BML) 635

A15 Cornelius Scipio Africanus, P. (JWR) 636
A16 Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum, P. (JWR) 636
A17 Cornelius Valerianus (JWR) 637
A18 Deculo (BML) 638
A19 Empylus (TJC) 638
A20 Fabius, M. (TJC) 639
A21 Fabius Gallus, M. (CJS) 639
A22 Fabius Vestalis (BML) 640
A23 Gellius, Sex. (CJS) 640
A24 Julius Caesar, L. (TJC) 641
A25 Julius Secundus (BML) 641
A26 Junius Brutus, M. (CJS) 642
A27 Licinius Mucianus, C. (BML) 642
A28 Maecenas, C. (CJS) 643
A29 Octavius Musa (CJS) 644
A30 Pescennius Festus (BML) 644
A31 Plinius Caecilius Secundus, C. (BML) 645
A32 Procilius, L.(?) (TJC) 645
A33 Sardus (and anon) (BML) 646
A34 Saufeius, L. (AD) 646
A35 Scribonius Curio, C. (CJS) 647
A36 Servilius (or Cornelius) Tuscus (BML) 648
A37 Tullius Cicero, Q. (AD, JWR) 648
A38 Valens (BML) 649
A39 Verrius Flaccus, M. (BML) 649
APPENDIX 2: Otherwise unknown historians and biographers cited in the *Historia Augusta* 650
APPENDIX 3: From Riccoboni to Roth: early editions of the fragments of the Roman historians (MPP, JWR) 652
APPENDIX 4: A note on dates (MPP) 661

VOLUME 2: TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

Typographical conventions viii

General Testimonia 2
Annales Maximi (JWR) 10
1. Q. Fabius Pictor (EHB, TJC) 32
2. L. Cincius Alimentus (EHB, TJC) 106
3. P. Cornelius Scipio Africani f. (JB) 122
4. A. Postumius Albinus (SJN) 124
5. M. Porcius Cato (TJC) 134
6. L. Cassius Hemina (JB) 244
7. C. Acilius (EHB, SJN) 272
8. Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (SJN) 282
9. L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (MPP) 288

10. C. Sempronius Tuditanus (CJS) 336
11. C. Sempronius Gracchus (JB) 344
12. C. Fannius (TJC) 346
13. Vennonius (SJN) 356
14. Cn. Gellius (JB) 362
15. L. Coelius Antipater (JB) 384
16. Paulus Clodius (JB) 424
17. Cn. Aufidius (CJS) 428
18. M. Aemilius Scaurus (CJS) 432
19. Q. Lutatius Catulus (CJS) 440
20. Sempronius Asellio (MPP) 446
21. P. Rutilius Rufus (CJS) 458
22. L. Cornelius Sulla (CJS) 472
23. L. Licinius Lucullus (CJS) 492
24. Q. Claudius Quadrigarius (JB) 494
25. Valerius Antias (JWR) 548
26. L. Cornelius Sisenna (JB) 600
27. C. Licinius Macer (SPO) 672
28. C. Piso (CJS) 698
29. M' Otacilius Pitholaus (CJS) 700
30. L. Lucceius (AD) 702
31. Q. Hortensius Hortalus (AD) 706
32. Lutatius (CJS) 708
33. T. Pomponius Atticus (AD) 718
34. T. Ampius Balbus (CJS) 730
35. P. Licinius Apollonius (CJS) 732
36. L. Scribonius Libo (CJS) 734
37. Munatius Rufus (CJS, BML, TJC) 738
38. L. and Q. Aelius Tubero (SPO) 746
39. M. Tullius Cicero (AD) 760
40. C. Oppius (CJS, TJC) 774
41. L. Cornelius Balbus (CJS, TJC) 782
42. M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (AD) 786
43. M. Actorius Naso (CJS) 790
44. Tanusius Geminus (AD) 792
45. Cornelius Nepos (JB, AD) 798
46. M. Tullius Tiro (AD) 816
47. P. Volumnius (AD) 820
48. Octavius Ruso (CJS) 824
49. Calpurnius Bibulus (AD) 826
50. C. Furnius (CJS) 830
51. L. Ateius Philologus (CJS) 832
52. M. Terentius Varro (AD) 836
53 Q. Dellius (CJS) 844
54. Cornutus (BML) 848
55. Sulpicius Blitho (CJS) 852

56. C. Asinius Pollio (AD) 854
57. C. Sulpicius Galba (CJS) 868
58. L. Arruntius (BML) 870
59. M. Vipsanius Agrippa (CJS) 874
60. Imp. Caesar Augustus (CJS) 878
61. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (AD) 896
62. T. Labienus (TJC) 900
63. C. Julius Hyginus (BML, TJC) 906
64. C. Clodius Licinus (SPO) 924
65. Julius Marathus (CJS) 928
66. C. Drusus (CJS) 930
67. Aquilius Niger (CJS) 932
68. Julius Saturninus (CJS) 934
69. Alfius (CJS, TJC) 936
70. Fenestella (AD) 938
71. A. Cremutius Cordus (BML) 964
72. Bruttedius Niger (BML) 974
73. Ti. Claudius Nero (BML) 980
74. L.(?) Annaeus Seneca (Maior) (BML) 982
75. Claudius (BML, TJC) 986
76. Ti. Claudius Herma Sideropogon (JWR) 994
77. Agrippina (BML) 996
78. Aufidius Bassus (BML) 1000
79. M. Servilius Nonianus (BML) 1008
80. C. Plinius Secundus (BML) 1012
81. P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus (BML) 1024
82. Cn. Domitius Corbulo (BML) 1030
83. C. Suetonius Paullinus (BML) 1034
84. Cluvius Rufus (BML) 1036
85. Imp. T. Flavius Vespasianus (BML) 1042
86. Vipstanus Messalla (BML) 1046
87. Fabius Rusticus (BML) 1052
88. Q. Junius Arulenus Rusticus (BML) 1058
89. Herennius Senecio (BML) 1060
90. P.(?) Vibius Maximus (BML, TJC) 1064
91. Ti. Claudius Pollio (BML) 1066
92. Pompeius Saturninus (BML) 1070
93. C. Fannius (BML) 1072
94. C. Pompeius Planta (BML) 1074
95. Cn. Octavius Titinius Capito (BML) 1078
96. Imp. M. Ulpius Traianus (BML, TJC) 1082
97. Imp. P. Aelius Hadrianus (BML) 1084
98. Bruttius (BML, JWR) 1090
99. Apuleius (TJC) 1096
100. Imp. L. Septimius Severus (BML) 1100
101. L.(?) Marius Maximus (BML, TJC) 1106

102. Asinius Quadratus (BML, TJC) 1128
103. Aemilius Sura (BML) 1144
104. Domitius (CJS) 1146
105. Egnatius (CJS) 1148
106. Juventius Martialis (BML) 1150
107. M. Octavius (CJS) 1152
108. Rubellius Blandus (BML, TJC) 1154
109. Anonymus 1 (JB) 1156
110. Anonymus 2 (JB) 1158

VOLUME 3: COMMENTARY

Note on bibliographical references viii

Commentaries on fragments of individual historians
Annales Maximi (JWR) 3
1. Q. Fabius Pictor (EHB, TJC) 13
2. L. Cincius Alimentus (EHB, TJC) 50
4. A. Postumius Albinus (SJN) 59
5. M. Porcius Cato (TJC) 63
6. L. Cassius Hemina (JB) 160
7. C. Acilius (EHB, SJN) 185
8. Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (SJN) 192
9. L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (MPP) 195
10. C. Sempronius Tuditanus (CJS) 222
11. C. Sempronius Gracchus (JB) 225
12. C. Fannius (TJC) 226
13. Vennonius (SJN) 228
14. Cn. Gellius (JB) 229
15. L. Coelius Antipater (JB) 243
16. Paulus Clodius (JB) 271
17. Cn. Aufidius (CJS) 272
18. M. Aemilius Scaurus (CJS) 273
19. Q. Lutatius Catulus (CJS) 275
20. Sempronius Asellio (MPP) 277
21. P. Rutilius Rufus (CJS) 284
22. L. Cornelius Sulla (CJS) 289
24. Q. Claudius Quadrigarius (JB) 300
25. Valerius Antias (JWR) 330
26. L. Cornelius Sisenna (JB) 368
27. C. Licinius Macer (SPO) 418
28. C. Piso (CJS) 450
30. L. Lucceius (AD) 451
32. Lutatius (CJS) 453

33. T. Pomponius Atticus (AD) 457
34. T. Ampius Balbus (CJS) 463
36. L. Scribonius Libo (CJS) 464
37. Munatius Rufus (CJS, BML, TJC) 466
38. L. and Q. Aelius Tubero (SPO) 469
39. M. Tullius Cicero (AD) 476
40. C. Oppius (CJS, TJC) 483
41. L. Cornelius Balbus (CJS, TJC) 486
42. M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (AD) 487
43. M. Actorius Naso (CJS) 490
44. Tanusius Geminus (AD) 492
45. Cornelius Nepos (JB, AD) 497
46. M. Tullius Tiro (AD) 505
47. P. Volumnius (AD) 509
49. Calpurnius Bibulus (AD) 511
51. L. Ateius Philologus (CJS) 512
52. M. Terentius Varro (AD) 513
53. Q. Dellius (CJS) 518
54. Cornutus (BML) 519
55. Sulpicius Blitho (CJS) 520
56. C. Asinius Pollio (AD) 521
57. C. Sulpicius Galba (CJS) 531
58. L. Arruntius (BML) 533
59. M. Vipsanius Agrippa (CJS) 535
60. Imp. Caesar Augustus (CJS) 537
61. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (AD) 546
62. T. Labienus (TJC) 551
63. C. Julius Hyginus (BML, TJC) 552
64. C. Clodius Licinus (SPO) 560
65. Julius Marathus (CJS) 564
66. C. Drusus (CJS) 565
67. Aquilius Niger (CJS) 566
68. Julius Saturninus (CJS) 567
69. Alfius (CJS, TJC) 568
70. Fenestella (AD) 571
71. A. Cremutius Cordus (BML) 592
72. Bruttedius Niger (BML) 594
73. Ti. Claudius Nero (BML) 595
74. L.(?) Annaeus Seneca (Maior) (BML) 596
75. Claudius (BML, TJC) 598
77. Agrippina (BML) 602
78. Aufidius Bassus (BML) 603
79. M. Servilius Nonianus (BML) 606
80. C. Plinius Secundus (BML) 607
81. P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus (BML) 611
82. Cn. Domitius Corbulo (BML) 612

83. C. Suetonius Paullinus (BML) 614
84. Cluvius Rufus (BML) 617
85. Imp. T. Flavius Vespasianus (BML) 620
86. Vipstanus Messalla (BML) 621
87. Fabius Rusticus (BML) 622
94. C. Pompeius Planta (BML) 624
96. Imp. M. Ulpius Traianus (BML, TJC) 625
97. Imp. P. Aelius Hadrianus (BML) 626
98. Bruttius (BML, JWR) 629
99. Apuleius (TJC) 632
100. Imp. L. Septimius Severus (BML) 633
101. L.(?) Marius Maximus (BML, TJC) 635
102. Asinius Quadratus (BML, TJC) 648
103. Aemilius Sura (BML) 656
104. Domitius (CJS) 657
105. Egnatius (CJS) 659
107. M. Octavius (CJS) 660
108. Rubellius Blandus (BML, TJC) 662
109. Anonymus 1 (JB) 663
110. Anonymus 2 (JB) 666

Chronological table of historical events recorded in fragments (TJC) 667

Indexes 681
1. *Index scriptorum* (TJC) 681
2. *Indices locorum* (TJC) 683
Sources of fragments 683
Sources of testimonia 695
3. *Indices uerborum* (AD) 700
Certain or probable fragments (Latin) 700
Possible or doubtful fragments (Latin) 723
Spurious or individually translated fragments (Latin) 725
Certain or probable fragments (Greek) 726
Possible Fragment (Greek) 727
4. *General Index* (TJC) 728
Persons 728
Selected Topics (including Peoples and Places) 759

Concordances (TJC) 773

LIST OF TABLES

1. Most frequently citing sources 39
2. Most frequently cited authors 41
3. Citation distribution in frequently citing sources 42
4 Distribution of verbatim citations in frequently citing sources 43
5. Citation distribution in Cicero 54
6. Citation distribution in Livy 84
7. Citation distribution in Servius and Servius Danielis 121

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Edward Bispham, University Lecturer and Tutorial Fellow in Ancient History, Brasenose College, Oxford and Lecturer, St Anne's College, Oxford (EHB)

John Briscoe, Honorary Research Fellow, University of Manchester (JB)

Timothy Cornell, Emeritus Professor of Ancient History, University of Manchester (TJC)

Andrew Drummond†, Formerly Senior Lecturer in Classics, University of Nottingham (AD)

Barbara Levick, Emeritus Fellow and Tutor, St Hilda's College, Oxford (BML)

Simon Northwood, Senior Master in Classics, Charterhouse, Godalming, Surrey (SJN)

Stephen Oakley, Kennedy Professor of Latin and Fellow of Emmanuel College, University of Cambridge (SPO)

Mark Pobjoy, Fellow and Senior Tutor, Magdalen College, Oxford (MPP)

John Rich, Emeritus Professor of Roman History, University of Nottingham (JWR)

Christopher Smith, Director of the British School at Rome and Professor of Ancient History, University of St Andrews (CJS)

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Journals and other serial publications

A&A	*Antike und Abendland*
A&R	*Atene e Roma*
AAHG	*Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft*
AAntHung	*Acta antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*
AAP	*Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Patavina di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*
AAT	*Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*
AATC	*Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Toscana La Columbaria*
AAWW	*Anzeiger Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*
ABAW	*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
AC	*L'Antiquité classique*
ACD	*Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis*
AClass	*Acta Classica (Pretoria, S. Africa)*
AE	*L'Année épigraphique*
AEHE	*Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Études*
AFLC	*Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari*
AFLM	*Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Macerata*
AFLT	*Annuaire publiée par la Faculté des Lettres de Toulouse*
AFMC	*Annali della Facoltà di Magistero dell'Università di Cagliari*
AHB	*Ancient History Bulletin*
AIIN	*Annali dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica*
AIISS	*Annali dell'Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici*
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*
AIV	*Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
AJAH	*American Journal of Ancient History*
AJPh	*American Journal of Philology*
ALLG	*Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*
AncSoc	*Ancient Society*
AncW	*The Ancient World*
AntTard	*Antiquité tardive*
APF	*Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*
APh	*L'Année philologique*

ArchClass	*Archeologia Classica*
ARG	*Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*
ASNP	*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*
BA	*Bollettino di archeologia*
BASP	*Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*
BCAR	*Bulletino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma*
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondence hellénique*
BFC	*Bollettino di filologia classica*
BHAC	*Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*
BJ	*Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn*
BMCR	*Bryn Mawr Classical Review*
BRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
BSGW	*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*
BSL	*Bollettino di studi latini*
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
C&M	*Classica et Mediaevalia*
CA	*Classical Antiquity*
CB	*The Classical Bulletin*
CCG	*Cahiers du Centre Gustav Glotz*
CEA	*Cahiers des études anciennes*
CHJ	*Cambridge Historical Journal*
CISA	*Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia Antica*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CPh	*Classical Philology*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CR	*Classical Review*
CSDIR	*Atti del Centro Studi e Documentazione sull'Italia Romana*
CW	*The Classical World*
DArch	*Dialoghi di Archeologia*
DHA	*Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*
EMC	*Échos du monde classique*
Entretiens Hardt	*Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique. Fondation Hardt, Geneva.*
F&F	*Forschungen und Fortschritte*
G&R	*Greece and Rome*

GB	*Grazer Beiträge: Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertumswissenschaft*
GFF	*Giornale Filologico Ferrarese*
GGA	*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*
GIF	*Giornale italiano di filologia*
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
HAC	*Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*
HSCPh	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift*
ICS	*Illinois Classical Studies*
InvLuc	*Invigilata lucernis*
JAW	*Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft*
JbKPh	*Jahrbuch für Klassische Philologie*
JHI	*Journal of the History of Ideas*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JML	*Journal of Medieval Latin*
JPh	*Journal of Philology*
JPhP	*Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*
JRA	*Journal of Roman Archaeology*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*
JWCI	*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*
LCM	*Liverpool Classical Monthly*
LEC	*Les Études classiques*
LSKPh	*Leipziger Studien für Klassische Philologie*
MAL	*Memorie dell'Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*
MAWBL	*Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen*
MD	*Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*
MDAI(R)	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*
MEFRA	*Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome (Antiquité)*
MH	*Museum Helveticum*
MIL	*Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo*
MNIR	*Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*
MPhL	*Museum Philologicum Londiniense*
NAFM	*Nuovi annali della Facoltà di Magistero dell'Università di Messina*
NAWG	*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.*

NC	*Numismatic Chronicle*
NClio	*La nouvelle Clio*
NJAB	*Neue Jahrbücher für Antike und Deutsche Bildung*
NJPhP	*Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*
ORom	*Opuscula Romana*
PACA	*Proceedings of the African Classical Association*
PAPhS	*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*
PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*
PCPhS	*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
PdP	*La Parola del Passato*
PhS	*Philologische Studien* (Leuven)
PhW	*Philologische Wochenschrift*
PLILS	*Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*
PLLS	*Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*
QS	*Quaderni di Storia*
RA	*Revue archéologique*
RAAN	*Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli*
RAL	*Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Rendiconti*
RBPh	*Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*
RCC	*Revue des cours et conférences*
RCCM	*Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale*
REA	*Revue des études anciennes*
REG	*Revue des études grecques*
REL	*Revue des études latines*
RFIC	*Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*
RH	*Revue historique*
RHD	*Revue historique du droit*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
RHT	*Revue d'histoire des textes*
RIN	*Rivista italiana di numismatica e scienze affini*
RomBarb	*Romanobarbarica*
RPAA	*Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia. Rendiconti*
RPh	*Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*
RPhilos	*Revue philosophique de la France et de l'étranger*
RQA	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*
RSA	*Rivista storica dell'antichità*

RSC	*Rivista di studi classici*
RSI	*Rivista storica italiana*
SBAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl.*
SCI	*Scripta classica Israelica*
SCO	*Studi classici e orientali*
SDAW	*Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*
SDHI	*Studia et documenta historiae et iuris*
SE	*Studi Etruschi*
SicGymn	*Siculorum Gymnasium*
SIFC	*Studi italiani di filologia classica*
SLLRH	*Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History (ed. C. Deroux)*
SNR	*Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*
SO	*Symbolae Osloenses*
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
StudRom	*Studi Romani*
StudUrb (B)	*Studi Urbinati. Serie B: Scienze umane e sociali*
SyllClass	*Syllecta Classica*
TAPhA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
VChr	*Vigiliae Christianae: a review of early Christian life and languages*
WJA	*Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*
WKPh	*Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*
WS	*Wiener Studien*
YCS	*Yale Classical Studies*
ZAnt	*Živa antika*
ZNTW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*
ZöG	*Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*
ZRG	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung*
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*

2. Works of reference and other works cited by short title

ALLP	*Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, *PBA* 129 (Oxford, 2005)
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*
BGU	*Berliner griechische Urkunden*

BNJ	*Brill's New Jacoby*; electronic publication: available at <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*
CE	*Carmina Epigraphica*, ed. F. Bücheler (part 2 of *Anthologia Latina*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1895–7)
CGL	*Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum*
CHCL	*Cambridge History of Classical Literature*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
DNP	*Der neue Pauly*
D-S	C. Daremberg, E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* (Paris, 1877–1919)
EV	*Enciclopedia Virgiliana*
FGrHist	*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby (Berlin, 1923–)
FHG	*Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. C. and Th. Müller (Paris, 1841–51)
FIRA	*Fontes Iuris Romanae Antejustinianae*, ed. S. Riccobono *et al.* (Rome, 1940–1)
FPL	*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, 4th edn., ed. W. Morel, K. Büchner, J. Blänsdorf (Berlin and New York, 2011)
GCS	*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*
GL	*Grammatici Latini* 1–7, ed. H. Keil (Leipzig, 1857–80)
HRF	*Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, ed. H. Peter (Leipzig, 1883)
HRR	*Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, ed. H. Peter, 1–2 (Leipzig, 1870, 1906); 1^2 (Leipzig, 1914)
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*
IGRR	*Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*
ILLRP	*Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Reipublicae*, ed. A. Degrassi (2nd edn., Florence, 1965)
ILN	*Inscriptions latines de Narbonnaise*
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, ed. H. Dessau, 1–5 (Leipzig, 1892–1906)
Inschr. Ephesos	*Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, ed. R. Merkelbach *et al.* (Bonn, 1979–84)
Inschr. Olympia	*Die Inschriften von Olympia*, ed. W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold (Berlin, 1896)
Inschr. v. Priene	*Inschriften von Priene*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1906)
Inscr. de Délos	*Inscriptions de Délos*, ed. F. Durrbach *et al.* (Paris, 1923–72)
Inscr. Ital.	*Inscriptiones Italiae*

IRT	*The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, ed. J. M. Reynolds, J. B. Ward-Perkins (Rome, 1952)
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*
LSJ	Liddell and Scott, *Greek–English Lexicon*, 9th edn., rev. H. Stuart Jones (Oxford, 1925–40)
LTUR	*Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, ed. E. M. Steinby (Rome, 1993–2000)
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*
MRR	T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* 1–3 (New York, 1951–2, and Atlanta, Ga., 1986)
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edn., ed. S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, E. Eidenow (Oxford, 2012)
OCT	Oxford Classical Texts
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
OGIS	*Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae*, ed. W. Dittenberger
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*
ORF	*Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, ed. E. Malcovati (Turin, 1953; 4th edn., 1976)
PDura	*Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report* 5.1: *The Parchments and Papyri*, ed. C. B. Welles (New Haven, Conn., 1959)
PFayum	*Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, D. G. Hogarth (London, 1900)
POxy	*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt *et al.* (London, 1898–)
PRyl	*Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, ed. A. S. Hunt *et al.* (Manchester, 1911–52)
PIR	*Prosopographia Imperii Romani*
PLRE	*Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*
RE	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa *et al.* (Stuttgart, 1893–1978)
Roman Statutes	*Roman Statutes*, ed. M. H. Crawford (London, 1996)
RPC	*Roman Provincial Coinage*, ed. A. M. Burnett, M. Amandry *et al.* (London, Paris, 1998–)
SB	*Sammelbuch griechischen Urkunden aus Ägypten*, F. Preisigke *et al.* (Strassburg, 1915–)
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
Syll^3	*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd edn., ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1915–24)

Texts and Transmission	*Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983)
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*
Vetter	E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1953)

3. Books and articles cited by author or author and short title

Agustín	see Editions (section 4)
Alföldi, *Early Rome*	A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor, Mich., n.d. (1964))
Astin, *Cato*	A. E. Astin, *Cato the Censor* (Oxford, 1978)
Astin, *Scipio*	A. E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford, 1967)
Badian, 'Early historians'	E. Badian, 'The early historians', in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London, 1966), 1–38
Badian, *Studies*	E. Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1964)
Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*	H. Bardon, *Les Empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien* (Paris, 1968)
Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*	H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine inconnue* 1–2 (Paris, 1952–56)
Beck–Walter	see Editions (section 4)
Beloch, *RG*	J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege* (Berlin, 1926)
Bernstein, *Ludi publici*	F. Bernstein, *Ludi publici: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele in republikanischen Rom* (Stuttgart, 1988)
Brennan, *Praetorship*	T. Corey Brennan, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic* 1–2 (Princeton, 2000)
Briquel, *Pélasges*	D. Briquel, *Les Pélasges en Italie: recherches sur l'histoire de la légende* (Rome, 1984)
Briscoe, *Comm.*	J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy* 1: Books 31–33 (Oxford, 1973); 2: Books 34–37 (Oxford, 1981); 3: Books 38–40 (Oxford, 2008); 4: Books 41–45 (Oxford, 2012)
Brunt, *IM*	P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower, 225 BC–AD 14* (Oxford, 1971)
Cameron, *Greek Mythography*	A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford, 2004)
Cameron, *Last Pagans*	A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford, 2011)
Chassignet, *Caton*	Caton, *Les Origines (fragments)*, ed. M. Chassignet (Paris, 1986)

Chassignet 1–3	see Editions (section 4)
Chilver, *Comm.*	G. E. F. Chilver, *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus' Histories I–II* (Oxford, 1979)
Cichorius, *RS*	C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien: historisches, epigraphisches, literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms* (Leipzig, 1922)
Cichorius, *Untersuch. Lucilius*	C. Cichorius, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin, 1908)
Coarelli, *Campo Marzio*	F. Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio* 1: *dalle origini alla fine della repubblica* (Rome, 1997)
Coarelli, *Foro Boario*	F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Boario dalle origini alla fine della repubblica* (Rome, 1988)
Coarelli, *Foro Romano*	F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano* 1: *periodo arcaico* (Rome 1983); 2: *periodo repubblicano e augusteo* (Rome, 1985)
Cornell, *Beginnings*	T. J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars, c.1000–264 BC* (London, 1995)
Cornell, 'Formation'	T. J. Cornell, 'The formation of the historical tradition of early Rome', in I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, A. J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing* (Cambridge, 1986), 67–86
Courtney, *ALP*	E. Courtney, *Archaic Latin Prose* (Atlanta, Ga., 1999)
Courtney, *FLP*	E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993)
Crawford, *RRC*	M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* 1–2 (Cambridge, 1974)
D'Anna, *OGR*	G. D'Anna, *Origini del popolo romano* (Milan, 1992)
De Sanctis, *SR*	G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* 1–2 (Turin, 1907); 3.1–2 (1916); 4.1 (1923); 4.2.1 (1953); 4.2.2 (1957); 4.2.3 (1964)
Douglas (*Comm.*) on *Cic. Brut.*	*M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus*, ed. A. E. Douglas (Oxford, 1967)
Drumann–Groebe, *GR*^{2}	W. Drumann, P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Übergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung* 1–6 (2nd edn., Berlin, 1899–1929)
Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG*	U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi, U. Walter (eds.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius* (Darmstadt, 2003)
Ernout–Meillet	A. Ernout, A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots* (4th edn., Paris, 1967)
Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*	P. Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite dans les Histoires et les Annales* (Paris, 1893)

Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*	D. Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar* (Berkeley, 2007)
Flach, *RGS*[3]	D. Flach, *Römische Geschichtsschreibung* (3rd edn., Darmstadt, 1998)
Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*	M. Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker* (Stuttgart, 1993)
Forsythe, *Piso*	G. Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition* (Lanham, Md., 1994)
Fraccaro, *Opuscula*	P. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* 1–2 (Pavia, 1956)
Frier, *Libri Annales*	B. W. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome, 1979; reprinted with a new introduction, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1999)
Frotscher	see Editions (section 4)
Funaioli, *GRF*	G. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907)
Furneaux (*Comm.*) on *Tac. ann.*	*The Annals of Tacitus*, ed. with introduction and notes by H. Furneaux, 1–2 (Oxford, 1884–91)
Gabba, *Appiano*	E. Gabba, *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili* (Florence, 1956)
Gabba (*Comm.*) on *App. b.c.*	*Appiani bellorum ciuilium* lib. i, ed. E. Gabba (2nd edn., Florence, 1967); lib. v (Florence, 1970)
Gabba, *Dionysius*	E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley, 1991)
Gabba, *Roma arcaica*	E. Gabba, *Roma arcaica: storia e storiografia* (Rome, 2000)
Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria'	E. Gabba, 'Considerazioni sulla tradizione letteraria sulle origini della repubblica', in *Les origines de la république romaine, Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 13 (Geneva, 1967), 135–69 (=Gabba, *Roma arcaica*, 25–50)
Gascou, *Suétone historien*	J. Gascou, *Suétone historien* (Rome, 1984)
Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*	J. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography, Historia Einzelschrift* 47 (Stuttgart, 1985)
Gelzer, *Kl. Schr.*	M. Gelzer, *Kleine Schriften* 1–3 (Wiesbaden, 1962–4)
Goodyear, *Comm.*	*The Annals of Tacitus Books 1–6*, ed. with a commentary by F. R. D. Goodyear, 1: *Annals* 1.1–54 (Cambridge, 1972); 2: *Annals* 1.55–81 *and Annals* 2 (Cambridge, 1981)
Gowing, *Triumviral Narratives*	A. M. Gowing, *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1992)
Grandazzi, *Alba Longa*	A. Grandazzi, *Alba Longa: histoire d'une légende* 1–2 (Rome, 2008)
Griffin, *Seneca*	M. T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford, 1976)

Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*	E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, NY, 1992)
Gruen, *Hellenistic World*	E. S. Gruen *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* 1–2 (Berkeley, 1984)
Gruen, *Roman Politics*	E. S. Gruen, *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts 149–78 BC* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968)
Gruen, *Studies*	E. S. Gruen, *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden, 1990)
Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.*	A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* 4 (Leipzig, 1893); 5 (Leipzig, 1894)
Haverkamp	see Editions (section 4)
Herzog–Schmidt	R. Herzog, P. L. Schmidt (eds.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* 1: *Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*, by W. Suerbaum, J. Blansdorf *et al.* (Munich, 2002); 4: *Die Literatur des Umbruchs von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur 117 bis 284 n. Chr*, by K. Sallmann, T. Doignon *et al.* (Munich, 1997); 5: *Restauration und Erneuerung: die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr*, by R. Herzog *et al.* (Munich, 1989)
Hinard, *Proscriptions*	F. Hinard, *Les Proscriptions de la Rome républicaine* (Paris, 1985)
Hirschfeld, *Kl. Schr.*	O. Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1913)
Hofmann–Szantyr	J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965)
Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*^{2}	L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement* (rev. edn., Oxford, 2003)
Horsfall, (*Comm.*) on *Virg. Aen.*	N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary* (Leiden, 2008); *Aeneid 3* (2006); *Aeneid 7* (2000); *Aeneid 11* (2003)
Horsfall, *Nepos*	N. Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus* (Oxford, 1989)
Horsfall, *Roman Myth*	N. Horsfall, J. N. Bremmer, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London, 1987)
Jacoby, *Atthis*	F. Jacoby, *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 1949)
Kaster (*Comm.*) on Suet. *gramm.*	C. Suetonius Tranquillus, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, ed. with an introduction, translation, and commentary by R. A. Kaster (Oxford, 1995)
Kaster, *Guardians of Language*	R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1988)
Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*^{2}	D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römisches Kaiserchronologie* (2nd edn., Darmstadt, 1996)

Kierdorf, *RGS*	W. Kierdorf, *Römische Geschichtsschreibung der republikanischen Zeit* (Heidelberg, 2003)
Klingner, *Röm. Geisteswelt*[4]	F. Klingner, *Römisches Geisteswelt* (4th edn., Munich, 1961)
Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger*	A. Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger* (Leipzig, 1940–1)
Köstermann (*Comm.*) on Tac. *ann.*	E. Köstermann, Tacitus, *Annalen*, 4 vols (Heidelberg, 1963–8)
Krause	see Editions (section 4)
Kühner–Gerth	R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, zweiter Teil: Satzlehre* (3rd edn., Hanover and Leipzig, 1898–1904)
Kuhner–Holzweissig	R. Kühner, F. Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre* (Hanover, 1912)
Kühner–Stegmann	R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre*, 3rd edn., rev. A. Thierfelder (Leverkusen, 1955)
Lange, *RA*	L. Lange, *Römische Alterthümer* 1–3 (3rd edn., Berlin, 1876–9)
Latte, *Röm. Religionsgeschichte*	K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1960)
Lebek, *Verba prisca*	W. D. Lebek, *Verba prisca* (Göttingen, 1970)
Leeman, *Orationis ratio*	A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers* 1–2 (Amsterdam, 1963)
Leo, *Gr.-röm. Biographie*	F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (Leipzig, 1901)
Leo, *GRL*	F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1: *Die archaische Literatur* (Berlin, 1913)
Leumann	M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (6th edn., Munich, 1977)
Leuze, *Jahrzählung*	O. Leuze, *Die römische Jahrzählung: ein Versuch ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung zu ermitteln* (Tübingen, 1909)
Luce, *Livy*	T. J. Luce, *Livy: The Composition of his History* (Princeton, 1977)
Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*	B. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus: Untersuchungen zu den Büchern 45–56 des dionischen Geschichtswerkes* (Wiesbaden, 1979)
Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies*	G. Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity* (Leiden, 2011)

Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*	J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997)
Marshall (*Comm.*) on *Asconius*	B. A. Marshall, *A Historical Commentary on Asconius* (Columbia, Miss., 1985)
Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico*	S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* 1–2.2 (Bari, 1965–6)
Michels, *Calendar*	A. K. Michels, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (Princeton, 1967)
Moles, *Comm.*	J. L. Moles, 'A Commentary on Plutarch's *Brutus*', Oxford DPhil. thesis (1979)
Momigliano, *Contributo*	A. Momigliano, *Contributi alla storia degli studi classici (e del mondo antico)*, 1–10 (Rome, 1955–2012) (cited as *Contributo*, *Secondo contributo*, *Terzo contributo*, etc.)
Mommsen, *Chron.*^{2}	T. Mommsen, *Die römische Chronologie bis auf Caesar* (2nd edn., Berlin, 1859)
Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.*	T. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* 1–8 (Berlin, 1905–13)
Mommsen, *Hist. Rom.*	T. Mommsen, *History of Rome*, trans. W. P. Dickson, Popular Edition (London, 1877–80)
Mommsen, *RF*	T. Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen* 1 (Berlin, 1864); 2 (Berlin, 1879)
Mommsen, *RG*^{2}	T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* (2nd edn., Berlin, 1856–7)
Mommsen, *Staatsr.*	T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* 1–2 (3rd edn., Leipzig, 1887); 3 (Leipzig, 1887–8)
Mommsen, *Strafr.*	T. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig, 1899)
Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*	F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (Berlin, 1897)
Münzer, *De Gente Valeria*	F. Münzer, *De gente Valeria* (Diss. Berlin, 1891)
Neue–Wagener	C. F. Neue, C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* 1–4 (3rd edn., Leipzig, 1902–5)
Niebuhr, *Hist. Rome*	B. G. Niebuhr, *The History of Rome* 1–2, trans. J. C. Hare and C. Thirlwall (Cambridge, 1831); 3, trans. W. Smith and L. Schmitz (London, 1842)
Niebuhr, *RG*	B. G. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte* 1 (3rd edn., Berlin, 1828); 2 (2nd edn., Berlin, 1830); 3 (Berlin, 1832)
Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* (on Horace)	R. G. M. Nisbet, M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes* 1–2 (Oxford, 1970–8)
Nisbet–Rudd, *Comm.* (on Horace)	R. G. M. Nisbet, N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace Odes* 3 (Oxford, 2004)
Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen*	H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin, 1863)

Noe, *Storiografia imperiale*	E. Noè, *Storiografia imperiale pretacitiana: linee di svolgimento* (Florence, 1984)
Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*[2]	E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* 1–2 (2nd edn., Leipzig, 1915–18)
Oakley, *Comm.*	S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books I–VI*, 1: *Introduction and Book VI* (Oxford, 1997); 2: *Books VII and VIII* (Oxford, 1998); 3: *Book IX* (Oxford, 2005); 4: *Book X* (Oxford, 2005)
Ogilvie, *Comm.*	R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965)
Pais, *Ancient Legends*	E. Pais, *Ancient Legends of Roman History* (London, 1906)
Pease (*Comm.*) on Cic. *div.*	Cicero, *De diuinatione*, ed. A. S. Pease, 2 vols. (Urbana, Ill., 1920–3)
Pease (*Comm.*) on Cic. *nat. deor.*	Cicero, *De natura deorum*, ed. A. S. Pease, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1955–8)
Pelling (*Comm.*) on Plut. *Ant.*	Plutarch, *Life of Antony*, ed. C. B. R. Pelling (Cambridge, 1988)
Pelling (*Comm.*) on Plut. *Caes.*	Plutarch, *Caesar*, translated with introduction and commentary by C. Pelling (Oxford, 2011)
Pelling, *Plutarch and History*	C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (London, 2002)
Perret, *Les Origines*	J. Perret, *Les Origines de la légende troyenne de Rome* (Paris, 1942)
Peter	see Editions (section 4)
Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*	H. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographieen der Römer* (Halle, 1865)
Peter, *Gesch. Lit.*	H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen* 1–2 (Leipzig, 1897)
Pöschl, *RGS*	V. Pöschl (ed.), *Römische Geschichtsschreibung* (Darmstadt, 1969)
Popma	see Editions (section 4)
Poucet, *Recherches*	J. Poucet, *Recherches sur la légende sabine des origines de Rome* (Kinshasa, 1967)
Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli annali*[2]	C. Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli annales di Tacito* (2nd edn., Rome, 1963)
Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire*	M. Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine* (Paris, 1953)
Rawson, *Intellectual Life*	E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London, 1985)

Rawson, *Roman Culture*	E. Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers* (Oxford, 1991)
Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate*	M. Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, bks 49–52* (Atlanta, Ga., 1988)
Riccoboni	see Editions (section 4)
Rich (*Comm.*) on Dio	Cassius Dio, *The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53–55.9)*, ed. with translation and commentary by J. W. Rich (Warminster, 1990)
Rich, 'Structuring Roman history'	J. W. Rich, 'Structuring Roman history: the consular year and the Roman historical tradition', *Histos* 1 (1997) (=*Histos* 5 (2011), 1–41)
Richard, *OGR*	J.-C. Richard, *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: Les Origines du peuple romaine* (Paris, 1983)
Richardson (*Comm.*) on App. *Hisp.*	Appian, *Wars of the Romans in Iberia*, ed. with introduction, translation, and commentary by J. S. Richardson (Warminster, 2000)
Rosenberg, *Einleitung*	A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur römischen Geschichte* (Berlin, 1921)
Roth	see Editions (section 4)
Rüpke, *Kalender*	J. Rüpke, *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: Die Geschichte der repräsentation und religösen Qualifikation der Zeit in Rom* (Berlin and New York, 1995)
Salmon, *Samnites*	E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge, 1967)
Santini, *Emina*	C. Santini, *I frammenti di L. Cassio Emina* (Pisa, 1995)
Schanz, *GRL*	M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1–3 (3rd edn., Munich, 1907–22)
Schanz–Hosius	M. Schanz, C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1 (4th edn., Munich, 1927); 2 (4th edn., 1935)
Schwegler, *RG*	A. Schwegler, *Römische Geschichte* 1–3 (Tübingen, 1853–5)
Scullard, *Festivals*	H. H. Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (London 1981)
Scullard, *Roman Politics*^{2}	H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220–150 BC* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1973)
Sehlmeyer, *OGR*	M. Sehlmeyer, *Origo Gentis Romanae, Die Ursprünge des römischen Volkes* (Darmstadt, 2004)
Shackleton Bailey (*Comm.*) on Cic. *Att.*	*Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 1–7 (Cambridge, 1965–70)
Shackleton Bailey (*Comm.*) on Cic. *fam.*	Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1977)

Sherk, *RDGE*	R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore, 1969)
Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*	A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966)
Skutsch, *Ennius*	O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985)
Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk*	W. Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk: seine Komposition und seine Quellen* (Leipzig, 1897)
Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt*	H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in der Geschichte* (Munich, 1938)
Sumner, *Orators*	G. V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology* (Toronto, 1973)
Syme, *AA*	R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1988)
Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*	R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968)
Syme, *Emperors and Biography*	R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1971)
Syme, *RP*	R. Syme, *Roman Papers* 1–7 (Oxford, 1979–91)
Syme, *RR*	R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939)
Syme, *Sallust*	R. Syme, *Sallust* (Berkeley, 1964)
Syme, *Tacitus*	R. Syme, *Tacitus* 1–2 (Oxford, 1958)
Thomsen, *King Servius*	R. Thomsen, *King Servius Tullius* (Copenhagen, 1980)
Till, *Lingua di Catone*	R. Till, *La lingua di Catone*, tr. C. de Meo (Rome, 1968)
Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios*	H. Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios* (Basle, 1977)
van den Hout, *Comm.* (on Fronto)	M. P. J. van den Hout, *Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto* (Leiden, 1999)
Vetter	E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1953)
Vossius, *Hist. Lat.*[2]	G. J. Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis* (2nd edn., Leiden, 1651)
Walbank, *Comm.* (on Polybius)	F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* 1–3 (Oxford, 1957–79)
Walde–Hofmann	A. Walde, J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–3 (3rd edn., Heidelberg, 1938–56)
Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*	A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius* (London, 1983)
Walsh, *Livy*	P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961)
Walt, *Macer*	S. Walt, *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer: Einleitung, Fragmente, Kommentar* (Stuttgart, 1997)
Wasse	see Editions (section 4)

Weinstock, *Divus Julius*	S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971)
Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*	T. P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature* (Leicester, 1979)
Wiseman, *Historiography and Imagination*	T. P. Wiseman, *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture* (Exeter, 1994)
Wiseman, *Remus*	T. P. Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth* (Cambridge, 1995)
Wiseman, *Roman Drama*	T. P. Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History* (Exeter, 1998)
Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome*	T. P. Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome* (Exeter, 2008)
Wissowa, *RuK*^{2}	G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (2nd edn., Munich, 1912)
Woodman, *Rhetoric*	A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London, 1988)
Zimmerer, *Quadrigarius*	M. Zimmerer, *Der Annalist Qu. Claudius Quadrigarius* (Munich, 1937)

4. Earlier editions of the fragments of the Roman historians (cited by author's name)

For a brief historical account see General Introduction, section 1, and, for a more detailed discussion, see Appendix 3 (I. 652–60).

Agustín	*Fragmenta historicorum collecta ab Antonio Augustino, emendata a Fulvio Ursino* (Antwerp, 1595)
Beck–Walter	H. Beck, U. Walter, *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker*, 1: *Von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius* (Stuttgart, 2001); 2: *Von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus* (Stuttgart, 2004)
Chassignet	M. Chassignet, *L'Annalistique romaine*, 1: *Les Annales des pontifes et l'annalistique ancienne (fragments)* (Paris, 1996); 2: *L'Annalistique moyenne (fragments)* (Paris, 1999); 3: *L'Annalistique récente. L'autobiographie politique (fragments)* (Paris, 2004)
Frotscher	*Caii Crispi Sallustii quae exstant ... accurate edidit ... Carolus Henricus Frotscher. Accedit ... veterum historicorum fragmenta plenius et emendatius edita* (Leipzig, 1825), 357–508
Haverkamp	*C. Crispi Sallusti quae exstant. ... Accedunt Iulius Exsuperantius et Porcius Latro ut et fragmenta historicorum, cum notis integris A. Popmae, Coleri, Ruperti, Wasse, Broukhusii etc. Cura Sigeberti Havercampi* (Amsterdam, 1742), 2. 257–396
Krause	A. Krause, *Vitae et fragmenta veterum historicorum Romanorum* (Berlin 1833)
Peter	H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* 1 (Leipzig, 1870; 2nd edn. 1914); 2 (Leipzig, 1906)

Popma	*Fragmenta historicorum veterum Latinorum, ab Ausonio Popma Frisio collecta, emendata et scholiis illustrata* (Amsterdam, 1620)
Riccoboni	*Antonii Riccoboni Rhodigini de historia commentarius cum fragmentis ab eodem Antonio summa diligentia collectis M. Porcii Catonis Censoris, Q. Claudii Quadrigarii, L. Sisennae, C. Crispi Sallustii, M. Terentii Varronis et scholiis eiusdem Antonii in eadem fragmenta* (Venice, 1568)
Riccoboni[2]	*Antonii Riccoboni Rhodigini de historia liber cum fragmentis historicorum veterum Latinorum summa fide ac diligentia ab eodem collectis et auctis* (Basel, 1579)
Roth	*Gai Salusti Crispi Catilina Iugurtha Historiarum reliquiae edidit . . . Fr. Dor. Gerlach. accedunt historicorum veterum Romanorum reliquiae a Car. Lud. Roth collectae et dispositae* (Berlin, 1852)
Wasse	*C. Crispi Sallusti quae extant . . . Accedunt Julius Exsuperantius, Porcius Latro et fragmenta historicorum vett. cum notis A. Popmae. Recensuit, notas perpetuas & indices adjecit Josephus Wasse* (Cambridge, 1710)

GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS (AND ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF READINGS)

These lists give the abbreviations and editions used for the ancient sources for the testimonia and fragments, and the additional sources of readings given in the *apparatus criticus* in this work which are not found in the specified edition or indicated ad loc., either in the *apparatus* itself or in the relevant commentary. Asterisks indicate works for which there is no recognized chapter division: these are cited by the page numbers of the listed edition. For abbreviations for other ancient works cited in the introductions or commentaries see *Oxford Classical Dictionary*[4], xxxvii–liii.

Except where otherwise stated in General Introduction, section 4, or in the commentary on individual fragments, the manuscript sigla used are those of the editions listed below, and these should be consulted for explanation of the sigla if required.

Abbreviations and Editions

Agathias *hist.*	Agathias, *Historiae*, ed. R. Keydell (Berlin, 1967)
Alcuin	Alcuin, *Grammatica*, in *Patrologia Latina* 101, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1863), 849–902
Amm. Marc.	Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. W. Seyfarth, L. Jacob-Karau, I. Ulmann (Leipzig, 1978)
App.	Appian, *Historia Romana*. Vol. 1, ed. P. Viereck and A. G. Roos, rev. E. Gabba (Leipzig, Teubner, 1962). Vol. 2, ed. P. Viereck (Leipzig, Teubner, 1905)
b.c.	*Bella civilia*
Gall.	*Keltike*
Hann.	*Hannibaike*
Hisp.	*Iberike*
Ill.	*Illyrike*
Mithr.	*Mithridatike*
Pun.	*Libyke*
Apul.	Apuleius
flor.	*Florida*, ed. P. Vallette (2nd edn., Paris, 1960)
mund.	*De mundo*, *Opuscules philosophiques et fragments*, ed. J. Beaujeu (Paris, 1973)
Arnob.	Arnobius, *Aduersus nationes*, ed. C. Marchesi (2nd edn., Turin, 1953)
Ascon.	*Asconius, ed. A. C. Clark (Oxford, 1907); ed. T. Stangl, *Ciceronis orationum scholiastae* (Vienna, 1912)

Athen.	Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, ed. G. Kaibel (Leipzig, Teubner, 1887–99)
Aug. *contra Iul. Pelag.*	Augustine, *Contra Iulianum*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 44. 641–874
Aur. Vict. *Caes.*	Aurelius Victor, *Caesares*, ed. F. Pichlmayr and R. Gruendel (Leipzig, Teubner, 1970)
Auson.	Ausonius, ed. R. P. H. Green (Oxford, OCT, 1999)
epist.	*Epistulae*
Bede	*Bede, *Liber de orthographia*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 7.217–94
Boethius *mus.*	Boethius, *De institutione musica*, ed. G. Friedlein (Leipzig, Teubner, 1867)
breu. expos. Verg. georg.	*Anonymi breuis expositio Vergilii georgicorum*, ed. H. Hagen, *Appendix Serviana*, in G. Thilo and H. Hagen, *Servii ... commentarii*, 3.2 (Leipzig, 1902), 193–320
Cassiod. *chron.*	Cassiodorus, *Chronicon*, in *Chronica minora saec. IV, V, VI, VII* vol. 2 (*Monumenta Germaniae historica, auctorum antiquissimorum* 11), ed. T. Mommsen (Berlin, 1894), 109–61
Catull.	Catullus, *Carmina*, ed. R. Mynors (Oxford, OCT, 1958)
Censor.	Censorinus, *De die natali*, ed. N. Sallmann (Leipzig, Teubner, 1983)
Charis.	*Charisius, *Ars grammatica*, ed. C. Barwick, rev. F. Kühnert (Leipzig, Teubner, 1964)
Chron. Pasch.	**Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1832)
Cic.	Cicero
acad.	*Academica*, ed. O. Plasberg (Leipzig, Teubner, 1922)
Att.	*Ad Atticum*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Leipzig, Teubner, 1987)
Brut.	*Brutus*, ed. E. Malcovati (2nd edn., Leipzig, Teubner, 1970)
cons.	*Consolatio*, ed. C. W. F. Müller, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia* 4. 3 (Leipzig, 1890), 332–8
de orat.	*De oratore*, ed. K. F. Kumaniecki (Leipzig, Teubner, 1969)
diu.	*De diuinatione*, ed. W. Ax (Leipzig, Teubner, 1938)
dom.	*De domo sua*, ed. G. Peterson (Oxford, OCT, 1911)
fam.	*Ad familiares*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Leipzig, Teubner, 1988)
fin.	*De finibus bonorum et malorum*, ed. C. Moreschini (Munich, Teubner, 2005)
Hort.	*Hortensius*, ed. C. W. F. Müller, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia* 4. 3 (Leipzig, 1890), 312–27
leg.	*De legibus*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (Oxford, OCT, 2006)
nat. deor.	*De natura deorum*, ed. W. Ax (Leipzig, Teubner, 1932)
off.	*De officiis*, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford, OCT, 1994)
orat.	*Orator ad M. Brutum*, ed. R. Westman (Leipzig, Teubner, 1980)

Planc.	*Pro Plancio*, ed. A. C. Clark (Oxford, OCT, 1911)
Q. fr.	*Ad Quintum fratrem*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1988)
rep.	*De re publica*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (Oxford, OCT, 2006)
sen.	*Cato Maior de senectute*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (Oxford, OCT, 2006)
Tusc.	*Tusculanae disputationes*, ed. M. Pohlenz (Leipzig, Teubner, 1918)
Verr.	*In Verrem*, ed. G. Peterson (2nd edn., Oxford, OCT, 1917)
Colum.	Columella, ed. V. Lundström *et al.* (Uppsala, 1898–1968)
Const. Porphyr. *de admin. imp.*	Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, ed. Gy. Moravcsik, with English translation by R. H. Jenkins (2nd edn., Washington, DC, 1967)
Cynthius Cenetensis	*Cynthii Cenetensis in Virgilii Aeneidem commentarium e codice Ambrosianae bibliothecae adjectis variorum notis*, ed. J. M. Dozio (Milan, 1845)
dig.	*Digesta Iustiniani* (*Corpus Iuris Civilis* 1), ed. T. Mommsen (Berlin, 1908)
Dio	Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, ed. U. P. Boissevain (Berlin, 1895–1931)
Diod.	Diodorus Siculus, ed. C. H. Oldfather *et al.* (London, Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1933–67)
Diomedes	*Diomedes, *Ars grammatica*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 1.299–529
DH	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, ed. C. Jacoby (Leipzig, Teubner, 1885–1905)
Donat. *Ter.*	Aelius Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, ed. P. Wessner (Leipzig, Teubner, 1902–8)
dub. nom.	**De dubiis nominibus*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 5.567–94
Euagrius *hist. eccl.*	Euagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier (London, 1898)
Euseb.	Eusebius of Caesarea
chron. (*Arm.*)	*J. Karst (ed. and trans.), *Die Chronik des Eusebios aus dem Armenischen übersetzt* (GCS 20 = Eusebius Werke, 5; Leipzig, 1911)
hist. eccl.	*Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. E. Schwartz (Leipzig, 1903–9)
Eutrop.	*Breviarium ab urbe condita*, ed. F. Ruehl (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1975)
excerpt. rhet. Paris.	**Excerpta rhetorica e codice Parisino 7530 edita*, in *Rhetores Latini Minores*, ed. R. Halm (Leipzig, Teubner, 1863), 585–9
Festus	*Sex. Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatione*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Leipzig, Teubner, 1913)
Flavius Caper	*Flavius Caper, *De orthographia*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 7.85–112

Frontin.	Frontinus
aq.	*De aquaeductu urbis Romae*, ed. R. H. Rodgers (Cambridge, 2004)
strat.	*Strategemata*, ed. R. Ireland (Leipzig, Teubner, 1990)
Fronto	**Epistulae*, ed. M. P. J. van den Hout (Leipzig, Teubner, 1988)
Fulgentius	Fulgentius, ed. R. Helm and J. Préaux (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1970)
myth.	*Mythologiae*
serm. ant.	*Expositio sermonum antiquorum*
Gell.	Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, ed. P. Marshall (Oxford, OCT, 1968, reissued with corrections, 1990)
Gran. Lic.	Granius Licinianus, ed. N. Criniti (Leipzig, Teubner, 1981)
HA (*Historia Augusta*)	*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. E. Hohl, C. Samberger, W. Seyfarth (Leipzig, Teubner, 1971)
Ael.	*Aelius* [*Caesar*]
Alex.	*Alexander Seuerus*
Aur.	*Aurelian*
Auid.	*Auidius Cassius*
Car.	*Carus, Numerian, Carinus*
Carac.	*Caracalla*
Claud.	*Claudius Gothicus*
Clod.	*Clodius Albinus*
Comm.	*Commodus*
Diad.	*Diadumenianus*
Did.	*Didius Julianus*
Gall.	*Gallienus*
Geta	*Geta*
Gord.	*Gordiani tres*
Hadr.	*Hadrianus*
Heliog.	*Heliogabalus*
Macr.	*Macrinus*
Marc.	*Marcus Aurelius*
Max. Balb.	*Maximus et Balbinus*
Maximin.	*Maximini duo*
Pert.	*Pertinax*
Pesc.	*Pescennius Niger*
Pius	*Antoninus Pius*
Prob.	*Probus*
quadr. tyr.	*quadriga tyrannorum*
Seu.	*Septimius Seuerus*

Tac.	*Tacitus*
tyr. trig.	*tyranni triginta*
Val.	*Valerian*
Ver.	*Lucius Verus*
Herodian	Herodian, ed. K. Stavenhagen (Leipzig and Berlin, Teubner, 1922)
Hier.	Hieronymus (St Jerome)
chron.	**Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, ed. R. Helm, 2nd edn. (*GCS* 47 = Eusebius Werke, 7; Berlin, 1956)
c. Ioh.	*Contra Iohannem*, ed. J. L. Feiertag (Turnhout, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 1999)
epist.	*Epistulae*, ed. I. Hilberg (2nd edn., Vienna, *CSEL* 54–6, 1996)
uir. ill.	*De uiris illustribus*, ed. W. Herding (Leipzig, Teubner, 1924)
Hor.	Horace, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1985)
ars poet.	*Ars poetica*
carm.	*Carmina*
sat.	*Satirae* (or *Sermones*)
Hygin. *fab.*	Hyginus, *Fabulae*, ed. P. K. Marshall (2nd edn., Munich and Leipzig, Teubner, 2002)
Isid. *etym.*	Isidore, *Etymologiae* (or *Origines*), ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, OCT, 1911)
Jos.	Josephus, ed. H. St. J. Thackeray and R. Markus (London and Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1926–65)
AJ	*Antiquitates Judaicae*
Ap.	*Contra Apionem*
uit.	*Vita*
Jul. Aeclan.	Julian of Aeclanum, *Ad Turbantium*, ed. L. de Coninck (Turnhout, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 1977)
Juv.	Juvenal, *Saturae*, ed. W. V. Clausen (Oxford, OCT, 1992)
Just.	Justin, *Epitome historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, ed. O. Seel (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1972)
Lact.	Lactantius
inst.	*Divinarum institutionum libri septem*, ed. E. Heck and A. Wlosok (Munich and Berlin, 2005–11)
ira	*De ira Dei*, ed. C. Ingremeau (Paris, Sources chrétiennes, 1982)
lib. de praen.	*Liber de praenominibus*, in J. Briscoe (ed.), *Valerius Maximus: Facta et dicta memorabilia* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner, 1998), 794–9
Livy	Livy, *Ab urbe condita*
	Books 1–5, ed. R. M. Ogilvie (Oxford, OCT, 1974)
	Books 6–10, ed. C. F. Walters and R. S. Conway (Oxford, OCT, 1919)

	Books 21–5, ed. T. A. Dorey (Leipzig, Teubner, 1971–6)
	Books 26–30, ed. P. G. Walsh (Leipzig, Teubner, 1986–9)
	Books 31–45, ed. J. Briscoe (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1986, 1991)
Livy *per.*	Livy, *Periochae*, ed. P. Jal (Paris, Budé, 1984)
Lucilius	Lucilius, *Carminum reliquiae* 1, ed. F. Marx (Leipzig, Teubner, 1904)
Lydus	Joannes Lydus
mag.	*De magistratibus*, ed. A. C. Bandy (Philadelphia, 1983)
mens.	*De mensibus*, ed. R. Wuensch (Leipzig, Teubner, 1898)
Macr.	Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, ed. R. A. Kaster (Oxford, OCT, 2011)
Macr. *diff.*	*Excerpta Macrobii *de differentiis et societatibus Graeci Latinique uerbi*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 5. 595–655
Malalas	John Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn (Berlin and New York, 2000). *Cited by the page numbers of the edition of L. Dindorf (1832) (see below, I. 90–1)
Mar. Victorin.	Marius Victorinus
rhet.	*Explanatio ad Ciceronis rhetoricam*, in *Rhetores Latini Minores*, ed. R. Halm (Leipzig, Teubner, 1863), 155–304
ars	**Ars grammatica*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 6.3–173
Mart. Cap.	Martianus Capella, ed. A. Dick (3rd edn., Stuttgart, Teubner, 1978)
Mela	Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia*, ed. A. Silberman (Paris, Budé, 1988)
Min. Fel.	Minucius Felix, *Octauius*, ed. B. Kytzler (Leipzig, Teubner, 1982)
Myth. Vat. prim.	Mythographus Vaticanus primus. *Le Premier Mythographe du Vatican*, ed. N. Zorzetti and J. Berlioz (Paris, Budé, 1995)
Myth. Vat. sec.	Mythographus Vaticanus secundus, in *Mythographi Vaticani I et II*, ed. P. Kulcsár (Turnhout, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 1987)
Nepos	Cornelius Nepos, ed. P. K. Marshall (Leipzig, Teubner, 1977)
Att.	*Atticus*
Cato	*Cato*
Hann.	*Hannibal*
Non.	*Nonius Marcellus, *De compendiosa doctrina*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, (Leipzig, Teubner, 1903). Cited by the page numbers of the editions of Mercier (1614) and Lindsay (see below, I. 95)
OGR	Pseudo-Aurelius Victor, *Origo Gentis Romanae*, ed. J.-C. Richard (Paris, Budé, 1983)
Oros.	*Historiae aduersum paganos*, ed. M.-P. Arnaud-Lindet (Paris, Budé, 1990–1)
Osbern	*Claudianus Osbern, *Derivationes*, ed. P. Busdraghi (Spoleto, 1996)
Ovid *trist.*	Ovid, *Tristia*, ed. S. G. Owen (Oxford, OCT, 1915)

Paradoxographi	*Paradoxographorum graecorum reliquiae*, ed. A. Giannini (Milan, 1966)
Paul. Fest.	*Paulus Diaconus, *Epitome* of Festus, ed. W. M. Lindsay (see above, Festus)
Pliny *epist.*	Pliny (the Younger), *Epistulae*, ed. R. Mynors (Oxford, OCT, 1963)
Pliny *nat.*	Pliny (the Elder), *Naturalis historia*, ed. L. Jan and C. Mayhoff (Leipzig, Teubner, 1889–1905).
Plut.	Plutarch
mor.	*Moralia*, ed. M. Pohlenz *et al.* (Leipzig and Stuttgart, Teubner, 1966–2001)
uit.	*Vitae parallelae*, ed. K. Ziegler (2nd edn., Leipzig, Teubner, 1964–73)
Ant.	*Antonius*
Brut.	*Brutus*
Caes.	*Caesar*
Cam.	*Camillus*
Cat. mai.	*Cato maior*
Cat. min.	*Cato minor*
Cic.	*Cicero*
Crass.	*Crassus*
Fab.	*Fabius Maximus*
Flam.	*Flamininus*
Luc.	*Lucullus*
Mar.	*Marius*
Num.	*Numa*
Oth.	*Otho*
Pomp.	*Pompeius*
Rom.	*Romulus*
Sull.	*Sulla*
TG	*Tiberius Gracchus*
comp. Dem. Cic.	*comparatio Demosthenis et Ciceronis*
comp. Nic. Crass.	*comparatio Niciae et Crassi*
Pol.	Polybius, *Historiae*, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst, (Leipzig, Teubner, 1882–1904); vol. 1 (1–3), ed. 2, 1922
Pomp.	*Pompeius, *Commentum artis Donati*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 5.82–312
Prisc.	*Priscian, *Institutiones grammaticae*, ed. M. Hertz, *GL* 2.1–3.384; *Partitiones xii uersuum Aeneidos principalium*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 3.459–515

Probus	Probus, *In Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarius*, ed. H. Hagen, *Appendix Serviana*, in G. Thilo, H. Hagen, *Servii . . . commentarii*, 3.2 (Leipzig, 1902), 323–87
	*Probus, *De nomine excerpta*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 4.207–16
Quint. *inst.*	Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford, OCT, 1970)
rhet. Her.	*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, ed. G. Achard (Paris, Budé, 1989)
Sall.	Sallust, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, OCT, 1991)
Cat.	*Catilina*
Iug.	*Iugurtha*
schol. Cic.	**Ciceronis orationum scholiastae*, ed. T. Stangl (Vienna, 1912)
schol. German.	**Scholia*, in *Germanici Caesaris Aratea, cum scholiis*, ed. A. Breysig (Berlin, 1867)
schol. Hor.	*Scholia in Horatium*, Porphyrio, ed. A. Holder (Ad Aeni Pontem, 1894); Pseudo-Acro, ed. O. Keller (2 vols., Leipzig, 1902–4)
schol. Isid.	*Scholia in Isidori Etymologias Vallicelliana*, ed. J. Whatmough *Bulletin du Cange* 2 (1925), 57–75; 3–4 (1925–6), 134–69 (Paris, 1926)
schol. Iuv.	*Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora*, ed. P. Wessner (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1967)
schol. Luc.	*Scholia in Lucani bellum civile*, ed. H. Usener (Leipzig, Teubner, 1869)
schol. Stat. Theb.	*Lactantii Placidi in Statii Thebaida commentum*, ed. R. D. Sweeney (Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner, 1997)
schol. (Verg.) Bern. georg.	*Scholia Bernensia in Vergilii georgica*, ed. H. Hagen, *NJPhP* Supp. 4 (1867), 749–83
schol. (Verg.) Veron.	*Scholia Veronensia in Vergilium*
Aen.	*Aeneid*: H. Hagen, *Appendix Serviana*, in G. Thilo and H. Hagen, *Servii . . . commentarii*, 3.2 (Leipzig, 1902), 413–50
georg.	*Georgics*: A. Lunelli, *Maia* 55 (2003), 5–83
Sen.	Seneca (the Elder), ed. L. Håkanson (Leipzig, Teubner, 1989)
contr.	*Controuersiae*
suas.	*Suasoriae*
Sen.	Seneca (the Younger)
apocol.	*Apocolocyntosis diui Claudi*, ed. P. T. Eden (Cambridge, 1984)
benef.	*De beneficiis*, ed. C. Hosius (2nd edn., Leipzig, Teubner, 1914)
dial.	*Dialogi*, ed. L. Reynolds (Oxford, OCT, 1977)
epist.	*Epistulae*, ed. L. Reynolds (Oxford, OCT, 1965)

uita patr.	*Vita patris*, in Peter, *IIRR* 2, 98
Serg.	*Sergius, *Explanationes in artem Donati*, ed. H. Keil, *GL* 4.486–565
Serv.	Servius, *Commentarii in Vergilium*
Aen.	*Aeneid* books 1–2: the 'Harvard edition', ed. E. K. Rand *et alii* (Lancaster, Pa., 1946)
	Aeneid books 3–5: the 'Harvard edition', ed. A. F. Stocker and A. H. Travis (Oxford, 1965)
	Aeneid books 6–12: ed. G. Thilo (Leipzig, 1884)
ecl.	*Eclogues*: ed. G. Thilo (Leipzig, 1887)
georg.	*Georgics*: ed. G. Thilo (Leipzig, 1887)
Sid. Apoll. *epist.*	Sidonius Apollonaris, *Epistulae*, ed. A. Loyen (Paris, Budé, 1960–70)
Solin.	Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. T. Mommsen (2nd edn., Berlin, 1895)
Stat. *silu.*	Statius, *Siluae*, book 4, ed. K. M. Coleman (Oxford, 1988)
Steph. Byz.	Stephanus Byzantinus, *Ethnica*, *A–I* ed. M. Billerbeck and C. Zuber (Berlin and New York, 2006–11), *K–Ω* ed. A. Meineke (Berlin, 1849, repr. Graz, 1958)
Strabo	Strabo, *Geographica*, ed. S. Radt (Göttingen, 2002–5)
Suda	Suda: *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler (Stuttgart, 1928–38)
Suet.	Suetonius
gramm.	*De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, ed. R. A. Kaster (Oxford, 1995)
uit. Caes.	*De uita Caesarum*, ed. M. Ihm (Leipzig, Teubner, 1908)
Aug.	*Diuus Augustus*
Calig.	*Gaius Caligula*
Claud.	*Diuus Claudius*
Iul.	*Diuus Iulius*
Oth.	*Otho*
Tib.	*Tiberius*
uit. Persi	*Vita Persi*, in *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum vitas reliquiae*, ed. A. Reifferscheid (Leipzig, Teubner, 1860), 72–5
uit. Plin.	*Vita Plinii*, in *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum vitas reliquiae*, ed. A. Reifferscheid (Leipzig, Teubner, 1860), 92–3
uit. Ter.	*Vita Terenti*, in *Aeli Donati quod fertur commentum Terenti*, vol. 1, ed. P. Wessner (Leipzig, Teubner, 1902)
Symmachus *ep.*	Symmachus, *Epistulae*, ed. O. Seeck (Berlin, 1883)
Syncell.	*Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga chronographica*, ed. A. A. Mosshammer (Leipzig, Teubner, 1984)

Tac.	Tacitus
Agr.	*Agricola*, ed J. Delz (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1983)
ann.	*Annales*, ed. H. Heubner (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1983)
dial.	*Dialogus*, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford, OCT, 1975)
hist.	*Historiae*, ed. K. Wellesley (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1978)
Tert.	Tertullian
adu. Val.	*Aduersus Valentinianos*, ed. E. Kroymann (Vienna, *CSEL* 47, 1906)
anim.	*De anima*, ed. A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa (Vienna, *CSEL* 20, 1890)
apol.	*Apologeticus*, ed. H. Hoppe (Vienna, *CSEL* 69, 1939)
nat.	*Ad nationes*, ed. A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa (Vienna, *CSEL* 20, 1890)
spect.	*De spectaculis*, ed. M. Turcan (Paris, Sources chrétiennes, 1986)
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, ed. J. Briscoe (Stuttgart and Leipzig, Teubner, 1998)
Varro	Varro
ling.	*De lingua latina*, ed. R. G. Kent (Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1938)
rust.	*De re rustica*, ed. G. Goetz (Leipzig, Teubner, 1929)
Vell.	Velleius Paterculus, ed. W. S. Watt (2nd edn., Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998)
Vincent of Beauvais	Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* (for text, see Cicero 39 F6 comm.)
uir. ill.	*De uiris illustribus urbis Romae*, in Aurelius Victor, ed. F. Pichlmayr, R. Gruendel (Leipzig, Teubner, 1970)
Xiph.	Xiphilinus: see above, Dio
Zos.	Zosimus, *Historia noua*, ed. F. Paschoud (Paris, Budé, 1971–89)

Additional Sources of Readings

'Peter' in an *apparatus criticus* refers to the second edition of vol. 1 of *HRR* (1914), or to vol. 2 (1906), as appropriate. Where a distinction is made between Peter's readings in the first and second editions of *HRR* 1, 'Peter (1870)' and 'Peter (1914)' are used. For 'Agustín', 'Popma', 'Krause', and 'Roth', see Abbreviations 4: Earlier editions of the fragments of the Roman historians (I. xxxviii).

Censorinus

17.13 (Piso 9 F38):

Baudou	A. Baudou, *RPh* 69 (1995), 15–37
Holzapfel	L. Holzapfel, *Römische Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1885), 235–8

Leuze	O. Leuze, 'Chronologisches zum Annalisten Piso', *Philologus* 66 (1907), 538–59
Matzat	H. Matzat, *Römische Chronologie* (Berlin, 1883), 1. 315–19
Mommsen (1858), (1859)	*Chron.* 1st edn. (Berlin, 1858), 186 n. 376; 2nd edn. (Berlin, 1859), 191 n. 376
Soltau	W. Soltau, *Römische Chronologie* (Freiburg, 1889), 227–30, 492
Triemel	L. Triemel, *NJPhP* 139 (1889), 345–54
Unger	G. F. Unger, *RhM* 35 (1880), 32–5

Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Cary	E. Cary, *The Roman antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (London, Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1937–68), ad locc.

Gellius

C	Cambridge, Clare College 26

7.9 (Piso 9 F29):

Cramer–Huschke	G. P. E. Huschke, *Die Multa und das Sacramentum* (Leipzig, 1874), 217 n. 229
Lange	L. Lange, *Römische Alterthümer* (Berlin, 1863–76), 2. 862 n. 5
Schulze	C. F. Schulze, *Von den Volksversammlungen der Römer* (Gotha, 1815), 358

Nonius Marcellus

Barabino	G. Barabino, *Studi Noniani* 1 (1967), 69–251, ad locc.
Sparti	A. Sparti, *Studi Noniani* 7 (1982), 247–78, ad locc.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

Only a handful of works on the history of Rome by Romans survive for us to read, as against more than a hundred attested writers whose works are lost. These are known to us only through citations and references in later authors. By a generally accepted scholarly convention the citations are known as 'fragments', some preserved in the form of direct quotations, but many as paraphrases of what the original author wrote. These fragments are of crucial importance for the understanding both of Roman historical writing and of Roman history itself.

There has been no comprehensive edition of the fragments since that of Hermann Peter, now about a century old.[1] Although it has remained a standard work of reference, Peter's edition has long been outmoded, and the need for a replacement is well recognized. Moreover, since it presents the texts only in the original Latin and Greek, with prolegomena and notes in Latin, Peter's edition is inaccessible to many of today's potential users. Partial replacements with translations and commentary in French and German have been provided by the recent editions of Martine Chassignet and of Hans Beck and Uwe Walter respectively, but these include only a selection of the earlier authors.[2] The present edition is the first to make the material available with translations and commentary in English, and the first since Peter to provide a comprehensive presentation of the fragmentary Roman historians up to the third century AD.

Our aim throughout has been to show readers what is known about the lost works and their authors by editing and translating the fragments and testimonia, and adding explanatory introductions and commentaries. We have sought at every point to make readers aware of the limits of what can be known.

This General Introduction opens with a discussion of previous editions (Section 1), followed by an exposition of the principles and methods adopted in the present edition, which is intended to provide readers with guidance for its use (Section 2). Section 3 gives a brief overview of what can be learned from the fragments about the prose style of the lost works, and Section 4 deals with the surviving authors to whose citation we owe the fragments: this section gives information about the authors and their works and explains special features; it also analyses the authors' use of the lost historical works and draws attention to the implications of their practice for our understanding of the fragments themselves.

[1] H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* 1 (Leipzig, 1870 (with the spelling *Relliquiae*); 2nd edn. 1914); 2 (Leipzig, 1906) (hereafter, *HRR*); reprinted with updated bibliography by J. Kroymann (Stuttgart, 1967 and 1993). Peter's term 'reliquiae' is commended by P. A. Brunt, *CQ* 30 (1980), 477–94, at 477: 'I prefer the term "reliquiae" to "fragments", a term which naturally suggests verbal quotations; in actual fact every collection of "fragments" abounds in mere allusions, paraphrases and condensations.' However, the term 'fragments' is too well established in scholarly usage to be dispensed with. Although mainly concerned with Greek historians, Brunt's essay is an excellent reminder of the limitations of what can be known of lost histories from later writers' evidence.

[2] M. Chassignet (ed.), *Caton: les origines*, (Paris, 1986); *L'Annalistique romaine* 1 (Paris, 1996); 2 (1999); 3 (2004). H. Beck, U. Walter (eds.), *Die frühen römischen Historiker* 1–2 (Darmstadt, 2001–4).

1. EARLIER EDITIONS

The first collections of the fragments of the Roman historians were produced by Antonio Riccoboni (1568, 1579), Antonio Agustín (posthumously published, 1595), and Ausonius van Popma (posthumous edition, 1620). Popma's collection was taken over with some modifications in the edition of Sallust by Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn (1634), and the practice of including the fragments of the Roman historians was maintained in numerous subsequent editions of Sallust down to F. D. Gerlach's edition of 1852, which incorporated the edition of the fragmentary historians by C. L. Roth. The only free-standing edition of the fragments published during this period was that of A. Krause (1833). For further discussion of these earlier editions see Appendix 3 (I. 652–60).

All previous attempts were superseded by the work of Hermann Peter. Peter was born in 1837, the son of Carl Peter, in his day a well-known historian of Rome.[3] After studying at Bonn, Peter followed his father's example in making a school rather than a university career, and from 1871 until his retirement in 1905 he served at the Gymnasium of St Afra in Meissen, from 1874 as its Rektor. Apart from an edition of Ovid's *Fasti*,[4] almost all of his substantial scholarly output was concerned with Roman historical writing. According to his biographer, he formed the plan of producing a new edition of the fragments of the Roman historians as early as 1858, while still a student.[5] In this project he had two main aims: first, to produce an edition that would reach the highest scholarly standards, and second, to extend it to include all the historians of the post-republican period, of whom only a few had been treated in the earlier editions.[6] Peter presented his edition of the republican historians in the first volume of *HRR*, published in 1870. Both these and the post-republican historians were included in the *editio minor* of 1883 for the Teubner series,[7] but the critical edition of the latter, with apparatus, notes, and prolegomena, was not completed until his retirement and the appearance of the long-postponed second volume of *HRR* in 1906. Peter then finally returned to the revision of the first volume, and was working on the proofs of the second edition at the time of his death in 1914.

Peter's work marked a huge advance. He extended the range of authors covered down to the late empire. For the period covered by the earlier editions he added only a small number of new authors and fragments, but the quality of his treatment was vastly superior. He sought to arrange the fragments as far as possible as they might have appeared in the original work (only Roth, the most recent of the earlier editors,

[3] Carl Ludwig Peter (1808–93) is best known for his three-volume *Geschichte Roms* (Halle, 1853–65), which was republished in a series of revised editions down to 1881. But other works, such as a commentary on Xenophon's *Hellenica* (Halle, 1837), a monograph on Livy's use of Polybius in the third decade (*Livius und Polybius, über die Quellen des xxi und xxii Buchs des Livius* (Halle, 1863)), and a wider study of the sources for Roman history (*Zur Kritik der Quellen der älteren römischen Geschichte* (Halle, 1879)), bear witness to an interest in ancient historiography that he shared with his son.

[4] *P. Ovidi Nasonis fastorum libri sex* (Leipzig, 1874).

[5] Biographical details about Hermann Peter (1837–1914) can be found in the obituary by A. Weinhold, in *Bursians Biographisches Jahrbuch* 37 (1915), 40–61.

[6] *HRR* 1 (1870), viii. Peter's prefatory statement of the principles of his edition, included at *HRR* 1 (1870), vii–xi, was unfortunately not reproduced in the second (1914) edition, which is now generally used.

[7] *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1883), hereafter *HRF*.

had attempted this). The fragments were also equipped for the first time with a detailed critical apparatus and notes identifying the historical context and parallel passages, while the elaborate prolegomena included full discussions of the authors' lives and works.

The format of Peter's edition was unprecedented for the fragments of the Roman historians, but it was not in fact a complete novelty. On the contrary, it followed a model for up-to-date critical editions which had been established in German scholarship since the 1850s. Notable editions of fragments which adopted a similar pattern include the three which Peter himself cites as models: Ribbeck's edition of the fragments of Roman drama, his teacher Vahlen's edition of Ennius, and Jordan's edition of the lost works of Cato.[8] In these works too the fragments are preceded by weighty prolegomena, and we find the same triple layout on the page of fragments, notes, and critical apparatus. The similarity with Jordan's edition is particularly close, and it may have been Jordan who pioneered the neat device of the asterisk to identify fragments which can be ascribed to a numbered book without explicit attribution in the source.

Thus when Peter published the first edition of *HRR* 1, it conformed to the highest standards of contemporary scholarship. However, when in his old age he produced the editions we still use today, *HRR* 2 and the second edition of *HRR* 1, he adhered to the same format, which by then was beginning to seem old-fashioned. Already in 1909 Felix Jacoby (1876–1959) had issued his prospectus for a new edition of the fragments of the Greek historians on radically different lines.[9] Thus Peter's edition is not only around a hundred years old, but conforms to philological standards set half a century earlier still. It is hardly surprising that it should be generally regarded as inadequate for modern purposes.

Jacoby fulfilled his promise with the progressive publication of a monumental edition of the fragments of the Greek historians (still incomplete), which set new standards in the study of lost historians.[10] As a result, the shortcomings of Peter's

[8] O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta* 1–2 (Leipzig, 1852–5); J. Vahlen, *Enniunae poesis reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1854); H. Jordan, *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant* (Leipzig, 1860). For Peter's reference to these works as models see *HRR* 1 (1870), vi.

[9] F. Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einen neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9 (1909), 80–123 = Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leiden, 1956), 16–64. For a critique of Jacoby's scheme see now J. Marincola, 'Genre, convention and innovation in Greco-Roman historiography', in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 1999), 281–324.

[10] F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (*FGrHist*), 17 volumes in three parts (Berlin, Leiden, 1923–58). A three-volume index, by P. Bonnechère, was published in 1999. The following authors in our edition appear in Jacoby's work: Fabius Pictor (1), Cincius Alimentus (2), P. Cornelius Scipio (3), Postumius (4), Acilius (7), Aufidius (17), Rutilius Rufus (21), Lucullus (23), Atticus (33), Cicero (39), Dellius (53), Sulpicius Galba (57), Claudius (75), Asinius Quadratus (102). See the introductions to these authors for references to Jacoby's edition. The completion of Jacoby's work is progressing slowly, in a two-pronged approach: firstly, Jacoby's own unfinished commentary on part IIIC (Greek historians of non-Greek lands) is being revised and edited, with one fascicle published so far containing commentary on 608a, 608 (C. W. Fornara, Leiden, 1994); secondly, an international team directed by Guido Schepens is working on Jacoby's projected parts IV and V, with three fascicles of part IVa (Biography) published so far (J. Bollansée *et al.*, J. Radicke, Leiden, 1998–9). *Brill's New Jacoby* (in progress, directed by I. Worthington) presents an online edition of the fragments of the Greek historians, with English translations and commentary.

edition became all too apparent, and calls for a new edition of the fragments of the Roman historians were being heard as early as 1949, from none other than Felix Jacoby himself.[11] However, it was not until the 1990s that efforts to update Peter began to bear fruit.[12] As noted above, two new editions have recently appeared: a four-volume edition with French translations, by Chassignet, in the Budé series, and two volumes by Beck and Walter (see n. 2) with German translations. Separate editions of the fragments of the more important individual authors have also been produced: this too is a recent trend, in most cases belonging to the past twenty years.[13]

The editions by Chassignet and by Beck and Walter undoubtedly improve on Peter in various ways, most obviously by including translations and adding updated notes and bibliography, and well accomplish the aims which their authors have set for themselves. Moreover, both editions make good a serious omission by reinstating the fragments cited by the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, which Peter had excluded in the belief that the work was a Renaissance forgery. Chassignet has carefully revised the text of the fragments, providing a new apparatus based on the latest editions of the citing authorities and listing the manuscripts in her introduction. Beck and Walter explicitly forgo all such philological endeavours, adopting Chassignet's text, arrangement, and numbering of the fragments, and supplying no *apparatus*, but they provide extensive and up-to-date commentary on the historical topics to which the fragments refer.

However, although the editions of Chassignet and of Beck and Walter are valuable contributions, they do not provide comprehensive replacements of Peter. While Peter included the fragments of over 120 lost authors, Chassignet deals with only twenty-five, and Beck–Walter with just nineteen. Their selections include only the better-preserved historians of the republic; lesser-known republican figures are excluded,[14] as are all the historians of the imperial period.[15] The present edition is therefore the first to offer a coverage comparable to Peter's.

[11] F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), 284 n. 73: 'a renovation of H. Peter's conscientious collections with the addition of a commentary would be desirable. A treatment of Roman historiography is urgently needed; this would have to place the individual historians in the framework of the history and culture of their times, and to make an attempt at appreciating them as literary personalities.' Cf. B. W. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum* (Rome, 1979), 16. In his preface to the second edition (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1999), xii–xiii, Frier brings the story up to date.

[12] The proposed new edition planned by G. P. Verbrugghe (cf. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 15 n. 7) has not seen the light of day, and has presumably been abandoned.

[13] These include the editions of Cato (5) by P. Cugusi and M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi (2001), of Cassius Hemina (6) by C. Santini (1995), of Piso (9) by G. Forsythe (1994), of Claudius Quadrigarius (24) by S. Laconi (2005) and by M. Ambrosetti (2009), of Licinius Macer (27) by S. Walt (1997), of Augustus (60) by L. De Biasi and A. M. Ferrero (2003) and by K. Bringmann and D. Wiegandt (2008), and of Marius Maximus (101) by A. R. Birley (1997). Earlier examples include the editions of book 1 of Cato (5) by W. A. Schröder (1971), of Coelius Antipater (15) by G. W. Herrmann (1979), of Sisenna (26) by G. Barabino (1967), and of Fenestella (70) by P. Accornero (1978). For full details of editions of individual historians, see the bibliography at the start of each author introduction.

[14] Both Chassignet and Beck–Walter leave out P. Scipio (3), C. Gracchus (11), Paulus Clodius (16), Aufidius (17), Lucullus (23), C. Piso (28), Otacilius Pitholaus (29), Lucceius (30), Hortensius (31), Ampius Balbus (34), Apollonius (35), and Munatius Rufus (37). Chassignet also excludes Atticus (33), while Beck–Walter exclude Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8), Vennonius (13), Scaurus (18), the Lutatii (19, 32), Sulla (22), and Scribonius Libo (23).

[15] Neither goes beyond Tubero (38), so that all subsequent historians (39–109 in the present collection) are excluded.

We have sought throughout to present the material in ways that will clearly bring out what can be known about the lost authors and their works as well as emphasizing the limits of our knowledge. In pursuit of these aims, we have departed in certain respects from the practice both of Peter and of Chassignet and Beck–Walter. We have, for instance, followed Jacoby's example in including testimonia.[16] Typographical conventions have been used to identify what is being attributed by the citing source to the lost work (see Section 2.5). Another divergence concerns the ordering of fragments and their allocation to books. Scholars have not infrequently gone astray by taking as established some features of Peter's ordering which are in fact merely conjectural (the organization of books 2 and 3 of Cato's *Origines* is a notable instance). We have accordingly adopted a more conservative policy than our recent predecessors when assigning fragments to books and placing them in chronological sequence (see Section 2.6).

The arrangement and methodology of this edition (explained in the next section) are designed to make clear the distance that separates the lost originals from the surviving remnants, and to emphasize the uncomfortable fact that, all too often, the latter are inadequate to reconstruct the former, even in the most basic outline. We aim to draw attention to these uncertainties, and to make them clear to the reader. We do not shun conjecture or discussion of theoretical possibilities; but we have confined them to the commentary, and have not used them to identify the context of the fragments or to arrange them in order in the text. It is our hope that the conservative approach we have adopted to these tasks will make readers aware of the difficulties, and provide them with the means to conduct their own research and make their own decisions.

2. THE PRESENT EDITION

2.1. Scope

This edition presents the fragments of all Roman historians whose writings are not preserved in a direct tradition. For this purpose we have identified as 'Roman historians' all Roman authors of prose works dealing with some or all of the history of Rome and presented primarily in the form of a chronological narrative of political and military events. This definition is in broad agreement with our predecessors' practice, but several aspects require further comment.

The majority of the included works were written in Latin, but the earliest histories of Rome by Romans were written in Greek, and we have included both these and later histories written in Greek by native Roman citizens. Works by non-Romans are excluded, even in the case of authors (such as Theophanes of Mytilene or Juba II of Mauretania) who were granted Roman citizenship. On the other hand we have included Roman freedmen such as M'. Otacilius Pitholaus, P. Licinius Apollonius, M. Tullius Tiro, and C. Julius Hyginus (nos. 29, 35, 46, and 63 respectively).

[16] Peter included a selection of testimonia in *HRF* (1883), but not in either of the volumes or editions of *HRR*, and neither Chassignet nor Beck–Walter have included them.

Accounts of Roman history were written in verse from Naevius and Ennius on, but these works obviously call for and have always received separate treatment. For similar practical reasons we have, like our predecessors, excluded fragments of certain prose histories which would have taken up disproportionate space and which can be most conveniently consulted in separate editions. On this ground we have not included the fragments of works of which substantial portions survive intact and which can be consulted in editions of the works in question, for example the historical writings of Livy and Tacitus and Nepos' *De uiris illustribus*. Also excluded are Sallust's *Histories*, portions of which survive in a direct tradition, while a great many fragments were also preserved by later writers, and Granius Licinianus, parts of whose history survive in a palimpsest: separate editions are available in both cases.[1]

Our definition of 'historian' covers every Roman described in a reliable source as a *historicus* (or in Greek sources as ἱστορικός or συγγραφεύς), or as having written *historiae*, *annales*, or *res gestae* in prose. We have also included biographies of public figures and personal memoirs or autobiographies by public figures. Although such works were not deemed histories by the Romans, the utility of our collection would have been weakened by their omission, and we have accordingly followed Peter's example in including them.

With regret, we have followed our predecessors (other than Riccoboni) in excluding the so-called antiquarians—that is, authors of works dealing with the past of Rome but not in the form of chronologically organized narratives of political and military events. Works dealing with ancient Roman institutions, cults, festivals, and customs began to be produced in the second century BC by writers such as L. Aelius Stilo and C. Junius Congus 'Gracchanus', and the tradition reached maturity in the first century with Varro, Cornelius Nepos, and Verrius Flaccus, to name only some of the better-known Roman antiquarians.[2] The Latin word *antiquarius* ('antiquarian'), which was common in the Renaissance, has no ancient authority (although it is probably based on the title of Varro's greatest work, the *Antiquitates*), and it is not at all clear how these Roman scholars would have been described by their contemporaries. It is certain, however, that they were not regarded as historians, and never appear as such in texts where historians are listed and discussed.[3] In excluding antiquarians, therefore, we are not only following the example of previous editors, but are applying a distinction that would have been understood and approved by the ancients themselves. The exclusion has in any case been a practical necessity, to keep our project and the resulting publication within manageable bounds. Nevertheless, a modern edition of the fragments of these important writers remains an urgent need. At present, they are buried in collections even less accessible than Peter's, namely Huschke's and Bremer's editions of the fragments of the jurists and, Funaioli's and

[1] For Sallust's *Histories* the standard edition remains that of B. Maurenbrecher (1891–2); the most substantial fragments are available in the Oxford Classical Texts edition by L. D. Reynolds (1991), and P. McGushin has produced a translation and commentary (Oxford, 1992, 1994); see also R. Funari, *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Fragmenta* (Amsterdam, 1996). For Granius Licinianus see the edition of N. Criniti (Leipzig, 1981) and the commentary by B. Scardigli (Florence, 1983).

[2] On Roman antiquarian writing see esp. Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 233–49; A. J. Stevenson in L. Holford-Strevens, A. Vardi (eds.), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius* (Oxford, 2004), 118–55.

[3] e.g. the texts printed as General Testimonia 1–7 (II. 2–9).

Mazzarino's of those of the grammarians.[4] These writers played an important role in the development of the Romans' understanding of their own past,[5] and even now their fragments provide crucial evidence for many aspects of Roman institutions and culture. Moreover, as Momigliano showed, the methods and practices of the ancient antiquarians and their early modern successors have contributed hugely to the modern discipline of historical studies.[6] It is our hope that another team of scholars will undertake the taxing but important task of producing an edition of the fragments of these works which meets modern standards and needs.

Difficulties nevertheless remain. Some of the more prolific antiquarians also wrote historical works, and we have been faced with the question of deciding which of the works of, for example, Nepos (45), Varro (52), and Hyginus (63) should be considered historical and therefore qualifying for inclusion, a task made all the more difficult by the fact that each of those named wrote works straddling the boundary between the two types of writing. Similar problems arise with some of the lesser-known authors, whose inclusion depends on whether they are to be considered historians or antiquarians. Those authors and works we consider to be historical have entries in this edition; our reasons are set out in the introductions to the individual authors. Nevertheless, we are aware that a clear distinction is unattainable, and we admit that we have had to make some more-or-less arbitrary choices in marginal areas. Rightly or wrongly we have included the work on Trojan families by Varro (52) and that on Italian cities by Hyginus (63), even though they would probably not have been regarded by the Romans as 'history'; the same is no doubt true of the work *On the Arrival of Aeneas* by Postumius Albinus (4), the book on magistracies by Sempronius Tuditanus (10), and the *Critique of Chronology* by Paulus Clodius (16). Such works have been included in the interests of readers, and in the knowledge that no selection of Roman historians and their works could be definitive.

Generally speaking, however, our selection of authors and works is less inclusive than Peter's. Although he nowhere discussed his criteria of selection, it is evident that he intended to include only historians and historical works. But in a number of instances he admitted fragments of works that cannot possibly be regarded as historical, such as the treatise on pontifical law attributed to a Fabius Pictor and the *Milesiae* of Sisenna, as well as marginal cases such as the *exempla* of Nepos and Hyginus.[7] He also included a number of writers who in our view have no good claim to be regarded as historians, and therefore do not appear in this edition. In an appendix to this volume (Appendix 1, I. 629–49) we have listed these excluded authors, as well

[4] F. P. Bremer, *Iurisprudentiae antehadrianae quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1896–1901); P. E. Huschke, *Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianae reliquiae*", rev. E. Seckel and B. Kübler (Leipzig, 1908–27); G. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907); A. Mazzarino, *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesareae* (Turin, 1955).

[5] Notice in particular Cicero's tribute to Varro's *Antiquitates* (*acad.* 1.9), acknowledging that they had opened the Romans' eyes to the realities of their own past.

[6] A. Momigliano, 'Ancient history and the antiquarian', *JWCI* 13 (1950), 285–315 (= *Contributo*, 67–106 = *Studies in Historiography* (London, 1966), 1–39). For responses to Momigliano's famous thesis see esp. M. H. Crawford and C. R. Ligota (eds.), *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London, 1995); P. N. Miller (ed.), *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto, 2007).

[7] Peter, *HRR* 1[2]. 114–16, 297; 2. 26–34, 72. See I. 165, 309–10, 396–8, 480–1.

as some others who are sometimes considered historians but whose credentials seem to us to be inadequate, together with a brief statement in each case of our reasons for excluding them.

Our collection comprises the edited fragments of 110 lost historians, each of whom has been assigned a number. The first entry, which is not numbered, deals with the *Annales Maximi*; the individual authors follow, starting with Q. Fabius Pictor (no. 1), the first Roman historian. The entries are listed successively, in broadly chronological order, at least down to the age of Sulla (nos. 1–22) and in the imperial period from the reign of Tiberius onwards (70–102). A chronological arrangement is virtually impossible, however, for the large number of authors (23–69) who lived in the late republican and Augustan periods, since the dates of composition or publication of their works are in most cases unknown. These authors are therefore grouped together as contemporaries according to the periods in which they are known to have been active. In general there is much uncertainty about the dating of many of the authors and works featured in this collection, and readers are urged not to draw any inference about relative dating from the order we have adopted but to consult the individual author introductions, in which issues of dating and relative priority are discussed. The writers whose dates are wholly unknown come at the end (nos. 103–10).

Our collection terminates in the third century AD, with the latest entries, Marius Maximus (101) and Asinius Quadratus (102), dating probably from the first half of the century. No historians are known to have written in the later third century, and the historiography that resumed in the fourth century represents the start of a new era, differing radically from what preceded, above all as a result of the rise of Christian historical writing.[8] Peter ended his own collection at roughly the same point, and for the same reason.[9]

[8] On the new directions in late antique historiography see the classic study of A. Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian historiography in the fourth century AD', in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1963), 79–99 (= *Terzo contributo*, 87–109). For good surveys of the historical writing of the period see B. Croke, A. M. Emmett (eds.), *History and Historians in Late Antiquity* (Sydney, 1983); D. Rohrbacher, *The Historians of Late Antiquity* (London, 2002); G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity* (Leiden and Boston, 2003).

[9] Peter stated (*HRR* 2, vi*): 'substiti . . . in fragmentis colligendis intra Constantini Magni imperium, ultra quod praeter paucos eosque superstites, qui quae alii scripsissent, in epitomas redigerent resque traditas usque ad suam aetatem supplerent, omnis historia ad christianos Graecosque migrauit' ('I have . . . stopped collecting fragments at the reign of Constantine the Great, beyond which, apart from a few surviving authors who reduced what others had written to epitomes and supplemented them with accounts of subsequent events up to their own time, all historical writing passed to the Christians and Greeks'). Peter included surely spurious memoirs of Constantine, attested only in two allusions in Lydus (*mag.* 2.30, 3.33; *HRR* 2. 155), and went beyond his declared limit to include one group of later pagan historians, namely Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (*PLRE* 1 *Flavianus* 15), author of *annales* dedicated to Theodosius which are known only from an inscription set up after his suicide in 394 (*CIL* 6.1783 = *ILS* 2948); Symmachus' correspondent Naucellius; and Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, consul 485 (*PLRE* 2 *Symmachus* 10), whose *Historia Romana* was cited as a source by Jordanes. For these writers see Peter, *HRR* 2. cciv–ccvii, 156–8; A. R. Birley, in Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity*, 129–32, 145; Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 627–90. On the numerous bogus historians cited in the later lives in the *Historia Augusta*, whose authenticity was mistakenly upheld by Peter and which take up a substantial portion of his second volume (*HRR* 2. clxxiv–clxlv, clxlvii–cciii, 129–42, 147–55), see I. 78, 650–1.

2.2. Structure and contents

The present work is divided into three volumes, each of which deals with the individual authors successively and in numerical order. In the first volume this General Introduction is followed by introductions for individual authors and their works. The second volume contains the testimonia and fragments for each author, with facing translation: further explanation relating to these is given in the following sections of this General Introduction. The third volume is devoted to commentary on the fragments. It will thus be possible for readers to refer simultaneously to the introduction, text, and commentary of any given author. We hope that this arrangement will prove more convenient for the reader than one in which all the materials relating to an author are contained in the same volume.

For readers' convenience we have used short-title rather than author–date abbreviation for modern works. Frequently referenced works are cited throughout in abbreviated form: these abbreviations and the corresponding full bibliographical details are set out in the section on Abbreviations at the start of this volume (I. xxii–xxxix). That section also includes a separate list of abbreviations for journals and other serial publications, which mostly follow those used in *L'Année philologique*.

Each author introduction begins with a list of references to Peter's edition in *HRR* and other modern editions, followed by a list of principal discussions in chronological order of publication.[10] These include full bibliographical details for all works not included in the schedule of Abbreviations (above, I. xxix–xxxviii). Where these principal discussions are subsequently cited in the introduction and commentary on the author to whom they refer, they generally appear in abbreviated form with the date of publication in parenthesis, to allow ease of reference to the chronologically ordered lists. Works cited in abbreviated form but without a date of publication can be found listed in full in the schedule of Abbreviations.

The author introductions deal with each author's life and historical work(s), normally in separate sections. For well-known figures such as Cato or Sulla, the section dealing with their life merely summarizes the main biographical facts. For lesser-known authors this section deals with all the available evidence bearing on their lives, and in a number of cases includes extended discussion of the author's identity and of when he might have lived and written.[11] The following section—'Work(s)'—discusses every aspect of his work(s) and seeks to establish its (their) character and significance as far as the evidence permits. Topics considered typically include transmitted title(s); form and scope; book number and structure; language and style; possible sources; distinctive peculiarities, interests, or biases, if any; and the work's place in the Roman historical tradition and likely influence. Where appropriate, consideration is given to the lost work's possible use as a source in extant historical

[10] The lists of editions give references only to Peter's latest editions, i.e. *HRR* 1[2] (1914) and 2 (1906), and do not include his earlier editions and those of his predecessors, discussed in Section 1 of this General Introduction and in Appendix 3.

[11] Authors whose identity is problematic include Tuditanus (10), Fannius (12), C. Piso (28), Lutatius (32), Bibulus (49), Furnius (50), Cornutus (54), Arruntius (58), Vibius Maximus (90), Bruttius (98), Marius Maximus (101), and Asinius Quadratus (102).

accounts.[12] Problematic issues in relation to the work's identity and nature are fully discussed, including, where applicable, its claim to qualify as a historical work by the criteria stated in Section 2.1.

Our primary objective in the commentary on the fragments has been to establish and elucidate what can be learnt from each citation about the content and character of the lost work. The commentary accordingly focuses in particular on the following: (i) explaining the context of the citation in the text of the citing author and (where this is not self-evident) the source's purpose in quoting or reporting from the lost work; (ii) discussing any difficulties in the text or interpretation of the citation; (iii) for non-verbatim citations, identifying what precisely is being attributed to the lost work (see below, 2.5); (iv) identifying the historical event or circumstance referred to, if any, and the fragment's place and function in the lost work, and, where these matters cannot be established with certainty, discussing the possibilities (see below, 2.6); (v) in the light of the foregoing, exploring any possible conclusions which can be drawn from the fragment about the overall nature of the lost work. As for the historical events and topics to which the fragments may refer, we have in general restricted ourselves to basic guidance and bibliographical indications and refrained from more extensive discussion: our aim has been not to provide a compendium of historical information, but simply to convey the best possible understanding of the lost works and the aims and methods of their authors.

The following concordances and indexes are provided: concordances to the editions of Peter, Jacoby, and Chassignet,[13] and to recent editions of individual authors; indexes of words cited in the verbatim fragments; indexes of citing sources for the fragments and for the testimonia; a general index to the work as a whole. In addition, a chronological table of events lists the fragments referring to each event.

2.3. Testimonia and fragments: text and *apparatus criticus*

Under *Greek and Latin Texts: Abbreviations and Editions* (I. xl–xlix) we list the abbreviations and modern editions of the sources from which we have taken our testimonia and fragments.[14] The text we have printed is that of the edition specified in the list, except where we found reason to adopt a different reading. We have in general relied on the reports of manuscript readings given in the listed editions.[15] For Nonius Marcellus, however, the manuscripts have been collated for this edition by JB (see on Nonius, I. 95), and we have also occasionally checked readings in manuscripts of other authors.[16] Except where otherwise specified, the manuscript sigla used are

[12] For such discussions see e.g. the introductions to Valerius Antias (25), Pollio (56), Pliny (80), Cluvius Rufus (84), Fabius Rusticus (87), Marius Maximus (101).

[13] The edition of Beck and Walter follows Chassignet's numbering of fragments, and is therefore not included in the concordance, except in the case of Atticus (33), who is not included by Chassignet.

[14] References to other ancient works use the abbreviations listed in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*[3], xxxvii–liii.

[15] A survey of the manuscript tradition of most of the Latin citing authors (the principal exceptions are the *OGR* and Priscian) can also be found in the relevant entries in *Texts and Transmission*.

[16] For Aulus Gellius, Leofranc Holford-Strevens kindly provided us with the readings of C (Cambridge, Clare College 26).

those of the listed editions, which should be consulted for explanation of the sigla if required.

We have not attempted to provide a full critical apparatus of the citing authors' texts, but merely to provide such textual information as is required for the study of the testimonia and fragments themselves. Accordingly, we include a critical note in the following circumstances:

(a) whenever the text we print differs from that of the edition used;

(b) in fragments which purport to be verbatim citations if either (i) the reading printed is not that of the paradosis, or (ii) it is not certain which reading is that of the paradosis, or (iii) though the reading printed is that of the paradosis, it is not beyond challenge, and it seems reasonable to indicate other readings, whether of manuscripts or of scholars in the age of print;

(c) in fragments which do not purport to be verbatim citations, and in testimonia, if either (b)(i) or (ii) or (iii) applies *and* the textual issue is of significance for the purpose for which we cite the passage.

Our apparatus is in all cases positive (i.e. it lists first the reading printed, with the MS evidence for it or the name of the scholar who first proposed it).[17] Sometimes, however, the apparatus of the edition we have used is negative (i.e. it cites only the reading(s) rejected, and, when the reading adopted is a conjecture, the name of its author). In these circumstances the evidence for the reading adopted has to be inferred *ex silentio*, and for that reason the conversion of an apparatus from negative to positive has to be viewed with a certain caution. At the same time it should be said that the fact that the apparatus of the edition we have used is positive does not guarantee its accuracy.

In verbatim fragments we have, for the most part, retained the orthography of the manuscripts. In non-verbatim fragments, and in testimonia, we have followed the conventions set out by Ogilvie in the preface to his Oxford Classical Texts edition of Livy 1–5 (xvi–xxiii). These include the use of *-es*, not *-is*, in the nominative and accusative plural, and of *-i*, not *-ii*, in the genitive singular of proper names. In addition, in the case of the names of individual Romans, we have adopted the form used in the *fasti Capitolini* (cf. Briscoe, edition of Livy 41–5, ix–x); this should not be taken to indicate that we believe that this was the form used by the citing author.

2.4. Testimonia

Volume 2 opens with seven General Testimonia (numbered as GT 1–7). These well-known passages, from Cicero, Dionysius, Velleius, Quintilian, Fronto, and the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, make general observations on Roman historical writing, and each refers to several of the authors in our collection. Where appropriate, these passages are also cited in whole or in part as testimonia for individual authors.

Following the practice of Jacoby, testimonia for individual authors, numbered in sequence (T1, T2, etc.), are presented before the fragments (F). The distinction

[17] We avoid 'voting lists' of those who have accepted the proposed readings.

between a testimonium and a fragment may be formulated as follows: a text that purports to quote or paraphrase a particular passage of a lost original is a fragment, whereas a text that gives information about the author or about all or part of his work, but without reference to a particular passage, is a testimonium. In a few cases we have counted as testimonia passages which previous editors printed as fragments: we have reclassified them in this way because the passages in question summarize or characterize a part of the lost work without quoting or paraphrasing a particular passage of the text.[18]

Our sources not infrequently preface a quotation or paraphrase of a particular passage with a general comment about the author or his work. In such cases, again following Jacoby's practice, we have printed the text as a fragment, but also have printed the comment as a testimonium. Thus, for example, Dionysius' citation of Cincius (2) at 1.74.1 appears as 2 F2 (for the report of Cincius' date for the foundation of Rome), but the first part of this text, informing us that Cincius was a senator, is also printed as 2 T2.

We include as testimonia all passages that have a bearing, however slight, on the lost historical works and the historiographical activities of their authors. We have been much more sparing, however, with passages that refer to other aspects of the authors' lives and careers, and have included these either by way of example (e.g. the career inscriptions for Pompeius Planta (94 T1) or Titinius Capito (95 T1–2)), or because they help to identify the author (e.g. Cn. Gellius 14 T4–5), or because of the possibility that they may derive from their lost works (e.g. Fabius Pictor 1 T3–4, Piso 9 T10–14). For some little-known authors we have included all the available evidence as testimonia (e.g. Aufidius (17) or Sisenna (26)), but in the case of major figures such as Cato, Sulla, Cicero, or Roman emperors, we have included only those texts that concern their writing of history.

We have generally printed the testimonia in order of citation—that is to say, the citing sources are given in chronological order of publication (certain or probable), and in the case of two or more citations from the same work they are printed in the order in which they occur in the surviving text. In certain cases, however, we have departed from this rule where it seemed appropriate to do so, and have included a brief prefatory explanation.[19]

Full account of the testimonia is taken in the author introductions, and we have therefore not supplied them with separate commentary. Where a particular testimonium raises special problems or requires explication, this is dealt with at an appropriate point in the corresponding introduction.

[18] One such instance is Fabius Pictor (1) T7, the Tauromenium inscription, which summarizes the first part of Fabius' work, unknown to earlier editors and printed as a fragment (F1) by Chassignet and Beck–Walter. Similar cases are Cato (5) T9 and T11e, which characterize respectively the prologue of the *Origines* and the account of Italy in books 2 and 3 (T9 = Cato fr. 3 Peter and 1.1a Beck–Walter; T11e = fr. 76 Peter, 3.9 Chassignet and Beck–Walter, F54 Cugusi). The citations of Marius Maximus (101) in the *Historia Augusta* are particularly problematic: on our classification of a number of these passages as testimonia rather than fragments see the author introduction for Marius Maximus (1. 610).

[19] The entries in question are: *Annales Maximi*, Fabius Pictor (1), Cato (5), Piso (9), Atticus (33), Cicero (39), Varro (52), Augustus (60), Claudius (75), Pliny (80), Arulenus Rusticus (88), Herennius Senecio (89), and Titinius Capito (95).

2.5. The fragments: verbatim and non-verbatim citations; identifying attributed material

Two of the fragments in the present work are short passages from unknown Roman historical works preserved on pieces of papyrus (109) or parchment (110). All the remaining fragments are citations by later authors. Many of these citations purport to be verbatim quotations from the lost works.[20] But these verbatim citations, particularly those by the grammarians and lexicographers, are mostly very short and were quoted purely to illustrate linguistic points; as a result, the reference of the quoted passage and its place in the lost work are often entirely uncertain. Many other citations, including all those by historians, make no claim to reproduce the lost author's actual words, but merely to report or paraphrase what he said. These matters are treated in more detail in the discussion of the citing authors and their methods of citation in Section 4.

Misunderstandings can easily arise through confusion over how much of a passage reproduced in a collection of fragments was in fact ascribed by the citing writer to the lost work. We have accordingly sought to clarify what is being attributed by the use of typographical conventions. All material attributed by the citing authority to the lost source is printed in bold type. Where it purports to be a verbatim quotation, the quoted words are printed in ***bold italic*** type.[21] Where it is not represented as a verbatim quotation, but just as a report or paraphrase of content, the attributed matter is printed in **bold roman** type. In such cases it is usually clear what is being attributed to the lost work: very often, the attributed matter simply comprises the words in indirect speech in the text of the citing author. Sometimes, however, it is not clear exactly what the citing author intends to attribute to his source: in these cases we have emboldened only those elements of the text that can with reasonable confidence be taken as attributed to the source, but in the knowledge that the fragment may in fact extend much further. For detailed clarification and discussion in any given case we refer the reader to the commentary.[22] Especial difficulties arise in the case of the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, a work which is full of source citations but frequently leaves it entirely unclear how much it claims to have derived from each source: on this problem see the discussion of the work in Section 4 (I. 96–101), and the fragment commentaries.

The true extent of a citing author's debt will often have been greater than the explicit attribution. Paraphrases may sometimes have incorporated wording taken over from the cited source. Much of the surrounding content may often have been

[20] In the index of passages that cite the fragments (vol. III, index 2.1) verbatim fragments are indicated in bold. The proportion of verbatim fragments varies enormously between citing authors. Relevant statistical details are given for each citing author in Section 4 of this General Introduction.

[21] We say 'purports' (*OED* s.v. 1b) because our use of bold italic type should not be taken as a guarantee of the accuracy of the quotation. In some cases the quotations are demonstrably inaccurate (e.g. in Cato 5 F1 the word-order in either a or b must be incorrect), and in others there are reasons for doubt. In such cases the question is discussed in the commentary, and we advise caution in all cases.

[22] For a particularly difficult instance see Fabius Pictor 1 F4a–b, where Dionysius and Plutarch give extensive reports of Fabius' narrative of Romulus' upbringing, but interspersed in both cases with authorial statements, material from other sources, and antiquarian asides.

drawn from the source in addition to the material explicitly attributed to it by the citing author, as, for example, with many of Livy's citations of Valerius Antias. Such questions are discussed in the commentaries, but we have not used our typographical conventions for material of this kind, but only to identify what is explicitly attributed.

A citing author's attributions may misrepresent the source. Direct quotations may be inaccurate (see n. 21), and paraphrases and reports of content may distort or even falsify the original. These possibilities should always be allowed for, and cannot be too strongly emphasized.[23] Our use of bold type is not intended as a guarantee of the accuracy of what is attributed to the lost source, but merely to highlight what the citing authority appears to be ascribing to the source.

In addition to what is being attributed to the source, we have (like some of our predecessors) also printed enough from the citing passage to make clear its context in the citing author's work and, where applicable, the historical reference.[24] Clarifications of context are also given in the commentary, and this has enabled us to avoid cluttering the text of our fragments with unduly long citations of contextual material. Thus, for grammarians' citations, for example, we often explain the linguistic purpose for which the grammarian cited the fragment in the commentary rather than by extending the passage quoted from the grammarian.

Ancient writers often cite several sources in the same passage, either attributing a particular account to all of them or comparing and contrasting their versions. Where such multiple fragments make comparisons, we cite the full passage under one (usually the first) author, but, where appropriate, cite shorter extracts under the other authors concerned.[25] Where the same material is attributed to more than one author, the fragment is cited in full in each case, with the single exception of Dionysius' report of the foundation story as given by Fabius Pictor, Cincius, Cato, Piso, and other unnamed writers, which, because of its length, we have cited in full only under Fabius.[26]

2.6. The fragments: attribution to author, work, and book; ordering

The identification of fragments' place in the lost works from which they are drawn and the ordering of the sequence of fragments from each work present complex problems.

Long prose works in antiquity took up several papyrus rolls and were accordingly divided into numbered books, and most of the works from which our fragments derive were of this kind. A good many of the fragments are cited with book numbers: such fragments provide evidence for the book structure of the lost works, and such information has been used to order fragment collections since the first Renaissance

[23] On misrepresentation in ancient authors' source citations see the salutary observations of Brunt, *CQ* 30 (1980), 479–83.

[24] As for example by Peter and Chassignet (and Jacoby). Note, however, that Beck and Walter revert to the earlier practice of printing only the purported fragments, without any surrounding text.

[25] e.g. Pliny, *nat.* 13.84–8, on the discovery of Numa's books in 181 BC, an important passage which gives citations from several historians' accounts. The passage is cited in full as Cassius Hemina 6 F35, and appropriate parts are then cited as Piso 9 F14, Tuditanus 10 F3, Antias 25 F9a, 55.

[26] DH 1.75.4–84.1 = Fabius 1 F4a, Cincius 2 F1, Cato 5 F14, Piso 9 F5.

editions (see I. 656). However, it is particularly the citing authors with linguistic interests, like the grammarians and lexicographers, who tend to record book numbers for fragments, and, as a result, the context of many of the fragments with book numbers cannot be established (see further Section 4). Like our predecessors, we have accepted the transmitted book numbers as a basis for ordering the fragments except in a small number of cases,[27] but it should always be remembered that numerals are particularly vulnerable to corruption in scribal transmission, and so any hypothesis about fragment location or book structure based on a single transmitted book number is necessarily insecure.[28]

In a very small number of cases, information is transmitted with fragments which indicates not only their book, but their place within the book, as with Cato 5 F1–2, cited as from the preface to the *Origines*, and Cassius Hemina 6 F32, the title to his fourth book.

Most of the lost historical works were evidently organized chronologically, and in such cases, where the events referred to can be ascertained, fragments can be arranged in the chronological sequence in which they would have appeared in the lost work. Accordingly, as we saw above, editors from Roth and Peter on have arranged the fragments not only by numbered books but also in chronological sequence.

While these principles are broadly sound, arrangements of the fragments have to some extent depended on conjecture, and there has been a widespread tendency to excessive confidence in the accuracy with which they reflect the structure of the lost work. We have accordingly adopted a somewhat more conservative policy towards arranging the fragments than Peter and most of his successors, in accordance with our overall aim of making clear not only what can be known about the lost works but also the limits of our knowledge. In particular, we have assigned fragments to a sequence on the basis of identified context only when the identification can be established with confidence; conjectural identifications of context are discussed in the commentary, but not used as a basis for allocation.

Issues relating to the arrangement of fragments of individual authors are discussed in the author introductions. The general principles we have followed in arranging the fragments of individual works are as follows:

(i) Fragments with book numbers and a clear historical context are arranged in their books in chronological order of the events referred to. Fragments without book numbers but with a clearly identifiable context are placed in sequence in the appropriate book or series of books, and are marked with an asterisk before their fragment number (as in Peter).

(ii) Fragments with attributed book numbers but without identifiable chronological context are arranged within the book after the chronological sequence and grouped by citing sources, with the sources in chronological order of publication (certain or probable) and in order of citation within each source.

[27] For example, fragments whose transmitted book numbers are demonstrably false are not included with book-numbered fragments, but with those 'not assignable to books', e.g. Valerius Antias 25 F58.

[28] Incorrect book numbers may not always be the result of scribal error in the transmission of the citing author. They might equally have been wrongly cited by the citing author himself, either because of his own carelessness or because of an error in his source (if he was quoting at second hand). Note the salutary example of Priscian's citations of Livy, as described in Section 4, I. 115.

(iii) Fragments not assigned to numbered books are placed after the fragments assigned to books. Fragments in this group are ordered by chronological sequence as far as this can be established, with the remaining fragments grouped by citing sources.

(iv) Where appropriate, doubtful fragments or other special categories are grouped at the end of the overall sequence.

For most authors, we have, like our predecessors from Roth onwards, presented the fragments as a single chronological sequence as far as this can be established. This applies both to authors for whom no book structure can be established, such as Fabius Pictor (1), and to authors for whom a high number of fragments with transmitted book numbers means that we are well informed about the book structure, for example Coelius Antipater (15) and Claudius Quadrigarius (24). However, for certain works for which book numbers have been transmitted for only a small number of fragments, we have found it preferable to group the fragments assignable to books first, followed by all the fragments not assignable to books, by contrast with the arrangement adopted by Peter, Chassignet, and Beck–Walter, which preserves a single chronological sequence. Although our arrangement for these authors has the disadvantage of creating two chronological sequences, this drawback is in our view outweighed by the greater clarity with which it brings out what can be known about the book structure of the lost work. Examples of works whose fragments we have arranged in this way are the memoirs of Sulla (22) and the histories of Valerius Antias (25) and Licinius Macer (27).[29]

The difference between our conservative approach to the arrangement of fragments and the orderings of Peter and his successors can be seen particularly clearly in the case of Cato's *Origines*. The second and third books, as we know from Nepos (T1), dealt with the origins of the Italian cities, and so it has been generally assumed that they were not organized chronologically. Peter, following Wagener and Jordan, arranged the fragments on the assumption that the second book dealt with northern Italy and the third with the south, and that within the books the material was arranged in a north–south geographical order, and this arrangement has been followed in subsequent editions and has helped to shape the modern understanding of this part of Cato's work. In fact, however, the distribution of material between these books is uncertain, and no information at all is available on how it was arranged within each book. We have accordingly arranged the relevant fragments simply by presence or absence of book attribution and by citing sources, to reflect the uncertainty and avoid imposing any preconceptions. Similarly, the general assumption that Cato's fourth book opened with a second preface in which he discussed historiographical issues rests simply on the successive editors' having opted to place F81 at the start of the fragments of this book; in fact, nothing indicates where it occurred within the book, and we have accordingly placed it simply by citing source.[30]

Further complications arise with authors of more than one work. For those known to have written more than one historical work, such as Cornelius Nepos (45), Pliny the

[29] Walt in her edition of Licinius Macer arranges the fragments on the same principles as those used in our arrangement.

[30] On the ordering of the fragments of the *Origines* see further I. 217–18.

Elder (80), or Asinius Quadratus (102), the fragments have been arranged as far as possible by the individual works, but, for ease of reference, we have followed Jacoby's practice of numbering the fragments in a single continuous series for each author. Both for these writers, and for those who, like Cato, wrote only one historical work but also works of other kinds, the assignment of fragments to specific works is sometimes problematic. The citing sources often supply the title of the work from which they are citing. Even when they do not, a fragment can often be assigned to a specific work by the author of multiple works on the basis of its content; we have drawn the reader's attention to such cases by a double asterisk after the fragment number. In other cases, however, the assignment of such authors' fragments to particular works must be regarded as uncertain, and, where appropriate, we have ordered such fragments accordingly.

There is also a significant number of fragments where uncertainty subsists over their authorship, for example because of inherent improbabilities in their attribution to an author, or doubts over the transmission of an author's name, or uncertainty about which author is meant. The author introductions discuss the particularly problematic issues over author identity which arise in some cases, for example Fabius Pictor (1) and Fabius Maximus (8), and the confusion between the historian L. Cincius Alimentus (2) and the later antiquarian L. Cincius.[31]

As a further guide to readers, we have adopted a typographical convention to indicate the confidence with which fragments can be assigned to authors and works. For fragments for which both the author and the work can be established with confidence, we have printed the fragment number in bold type. In cases where the author is certain but the work doubtful (for instance where there is a reasonable chance that the fragment is taken from another work by the same author), the fragment number is printed in normal type. In cases where the author's identity is uncertain, the fragment number is given in normal type and is placed in parenthesis.

3. LANGUAGE AND STYLE OF THE FRAGMENTARY ROMAN HISTORIANS[1]

3.1. The nature of the evidence

Although we may occasionally suspect that an author who does not claim to be giving a verbatim citation is, nevertheless, using the vocabulary of the cited historian,[2] it is only the verbatim citations that can legitimately be used in discussing matters

[31] Other examples include Q. Lutatius Catulus (19) and Lutatius (32), on which question see the introduction to Lutatius (32); Licinius Macer (27) and the poet Aemilius Macer, on which see commentary on Licinius Macer 27 F8, and F28–30; L. Scribonius Libo (36) and Livy, on which see commentary on Libo 36 F2; C. Clodius Licinus (64) and another Clodius or Claudius, or Licinius Macer (27), on which see the introduction to Clodius Licinus (64).

[1] This section is primarily concerned with the development of historical style before Sallust, the first historian any of whose works survive intact. For the evidence of the fragments of post-Sallustian fragmentary writers see I. 36–8.

[2] Cf. e.g. commentary on Coelius 15 F32, Quadrigarius 24 F66; see also n. 36.

of language and style. It has been calculated that the verbatim citations of those who preceded Sallust (i.e. all those contained in Peter's first volume, with the exception of Tubero[3]) are equivalent, in total, to some seventeen pages of an Oxford text, five of which are accounted for by the fragments of Cato.[4] Although this is a far from negligible body of material, it is, of course, only a tiny proportion of the total output of the writers concerned, and that must be borne in mind when evaluating arguments based on it, especially those that concern the first appearance of a word or usage. And since many of the verbatim fragments are cited for their linguistic interest, it does not follow that similar phenomena were to be found in all parts of the work.

In two well-known passages, *de orat.* 2.52 ff. (=GT1) and *leg.* 1.5–7 (=GT2), Cicero complained that those who had written history in Latin had, with the partial exception of Coelius Antipater, Sisenna, and Licinius Macer, done so without ornamentation. The majority of us believe that Cicero was talking about style and not, as Woodman argues,[5] content. He was referring, in particular, to the lack of periodic sentence structure, and shows no interest in the aspect on which our fragments provide the most evidence, and to which, as we shall see, many of the lost historians did devote care, namely vocabulary. There are, however, a number of longer fragments which enable us to evaluate Cicero's judgement in the case of Cato, Hemina, Piso, and Quadrigarius.[6]

3.2. Previous views

Remarks on the style of individual writers will be found in the work of a number of scholars,[7] but only two have dealt in any detail with the whole period from Cato to the early Ciceronian age.[8]

Badian ('Early Historians'), in what was a pioneering and influential article, did not present a systematic account, attaching his remarks to his treatment of the various historians. His position appears to be that, beginning with Fannius,[9] and with the exception of Antias, there came into existence a 'historical style', which was characterized by deliberate archaism (in order to write in the way in which Cato had written),[10] neologism, and what Badian insisted on calling 'oddities', by which he meant grammatical features which deviated from Ciceronian norms.

For Badian characteristics of this historical style are adjectives/adverbs ending in *-osus/-ose*, adverbs ending in *-im*, the third person plural of the perfect ending in

[3] On the identification and date of Tubero see I. 363–4.

[4] Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 207.

[5] *Rhetoric*, 76–95. For the position adopted here see S. J. Northwood, *Mnemosyne* 61 (2008), 228–37.

[6] Asellio 20 F1–2 cannot properly be included, since they do not form part of his narrative (cf. I. 29). The apparently contradictory judgement concerning Cato at *Brut.* 66 (Cato 5 T16) is not to be taken at face value (cf. Douglas ad loc.): nevertheless, Cicero may have had Cato's vocabulary in mind.

[7] e.g. Leo *GRL* 299–300, 325–46; Schanz–Hosius 1. 187, 193–209, 316–28; Leeman, *Orationis ratio*, 67–88).

[8] On the date of Antias see I. 294–6.

[9] Badian places Gellius and Piso before Fannius.

[10] At p. 11 Cato's style is said to have become 'a model in a new *genre*', but at p. 14 Fannius' aim was 'to achieve *dignitas* and perhaps evoke Cato'. Coelius is the first writer for whom Badian can adduce a substantial amount of evidence: he is also the first whom he discusses after Fannius, but nevertheless claims that 'he did not depart from what had become the custom of the genre' (p. 17).

-ere rather than *-erunt*,[11] and the passive form of *posse* (he ought to have added 'with the passive infinitive').[12] Unfortunately Badian mistook phenomena which were common in early Latin as peculiar to historiography; no one meeting them would immediately have concluded that the author in question was making 'a deliberate claim to be writing history'.[13] They were stylistically neutral, and could be used in any genre.

Thus the suffix *-osus* was an extremely common way of forming an adjective, with the meaning 'provided with', 'rich in', or 'resembling'[14] from a noun.[15] Of the twenty-nine instances that appear for the first time in Cato, only two are in the *Origines*.[16] Later, Scipio Aemilianus (*or. frg.* 17) used *uinosus* and *uirosus* (the latter is found also in Laberius and Lucilius).

Adverbs in *-(a)(t)im* abound in early Latin,[17] and the fact that there are instances in Coelius,[18] Scaurus, Quadrigarius, and, particularly, Sisenna (see I. 33–4) does not make them a characteristic of historical style.

The third person plural perfect in *-ere* was and remained the choice form.[19] In Cato it is the predominant form in both the *Origines* and the speeches, while the form in *-erunt* is used on the three occasions where that part of the verb occurs in the *De agri cultura*.[20]

The passive form of *posse* with the passive infinitive, found in Coelius 15 F4, Scaurus 18 F4, and Quadrigarius 24 F33, 47, occurs also in Ennius, Pacuvius, Cato *agr.*, the speeches of Scipio Aemilianus and Gaius Gracchus, the *repetundae* law of the *tabula Bembina*,[21] and Lucretius.[22] The usage may indeed have been an archaism for Quadrigarius, taken over from his predecessors, but it is quite likely that in the last third of the second century it was perfectly regular. In a period when all our evidence is fragmentary, other usages which seemed 'odd' to Badian may in fact have been normal at the time.

[11] In the case of Scaurus, Badian (37 n. 124) adduced what was in fact a fragment of a speech (*or. frg.* 7), not of his autobiography, printed by Peter under the heading *orationum reliquiae*.

[12] Cf. Badian, 'Early historians', 33 nn. 77, 80, 37 n. 124.

[13] Ibid. 37 n. 124, of Scaurus.

[14] D. R. Langslow, *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2000), 340; for its use in medical Latin, 340–5.

[15] Cf. A. Ernout, *Les Adjectifs latins en* -osus *et en* -ulentus (Paris, 1949); Leumann, 341; H. Rosén, *Latine loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin* (Munich, 1999), 54–6).

[16] 5 F33 *industriosissime*, 29 *sentinosus*. Nineteen are in the *De agri cultura* and five in fragments of speeches, while *consiliosus*, *disciplinosus*, and *victoriosus* are cited by Aulus Gellius (4.9.12) as words used by Cato, with no indication in which work(s) they occurred. This material is taken from the list in Till, *La lingua di Catone* (cf. n. 36), 78–90.

[17] See K. Bergsland *SO* 20 (1940), 52–85; E. Capaiuolo, *La formazione degli avverbi in latino* (Naples, 1967), 47–58; J. N. Adams, *ALLP*, 79–80. The only such adverb whose first appearance is in Cato is *minutim* at *agr.* 123; it occurs elsewhere in republican literature only in Lucilius.

[18] One of which, 15 F54 *pedetemptim*, occurs also in Plautus, Terence, a speech of Cato, Pacuvius, Lucilius, Quadrigarius (24 F94), Lucretius, and eight times in Cicero.

[19] Cf. C. E. Bauer *The Latin Perfect Endings -ere and -erunt* (Philadelphia, 1933); Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 146–7.

[20] Cf. G. Calboli, 'Nota di aggiornamento' in E. Norden, *La prosa d'arte antica dal vi secolo all' età della rinascenza* (Rome, 1986), 1089 n. 14.

[21] *Roman Statutes* 1, line 66.

[22] Cf. *TLL* 10.2.136.77 ff.

Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 194–290) took a totally different position. He believed that Sallust was the first Latin historian to indulge in deliberate archaism on a large scale, and therefore sought to minimize the alleged archaisms in Sallust's predecessors. He presents the detailed evidence in each case with scrupulous fairness,[23] but, in Oakley's words (*Comm.* I. 145 n. 179), 'the evidence presented by Lebek suffices to refute his own conclusions'.

This was caused, first, by his refusal to accept as an archaism anything except expressions which never occur in first-century writers before Sallust.[24] Second, Lebek believes (this particularly affects his view of the language of Quadrigarius) that historians were taking usages from the colloquial Latin of their time.[25] He holds that if a usage in a fragmentary republican historian is found otherwise only in late Latin, that is evidence for its continued existence in the spoken language. That is not a necessary conclusion even if the usage survived into Romance. And even if it is the case that a usage found in early Latin and a fragmentary historian but absent or virtually absent from Cicero and Caesar was part of the spoken Latin of the historian's time, it is still possible that he took it from earlier literature. Indeed, given the fact that Sallust and Livy, to different degrees, employed archaisms and poeticisms, it is much more likely that he was doing the same rather than going out of his way to take usages from the spoken language, something which Sallust and Livy avoided (cf. Oakley, *Comm.* I. 148). That is not to deny that there could be some items which are to be explained in this way.

3.3. Archaisms and neologisms

In what follows we refer to a number of usages which are absent, or virtually absent, from Cicero and Caesar:[26] some of these are found in Latin, primarily, of course, in poetry, of a time before that of the historian concerned, and others occur for the first time in the author in question. In discussing Sallust or Livy, it is not profitable to distinguish between 'archaisms' and 'poeticisms':[27] in the case of the fragmentary historians, we might have to do with a usage which occurred previously only in Cato, while a usage occurring otherwise only in first-century poetry cannot be classified as a poeticism for the historian.[28] We shall talk, therefore, only of 'archaisms'.

As far as the second category is concerned, it should be stressed that when so much Latin has been lost, both verse and prose, we can talk only of usages not being attested before the author in question, and there can be no certainty that any particular usage did not occur earlier. Two considerations, however, indicate that the compilation of

[23] We do not cite it in detail in the commentary except when it seems necessary to be specific. Lebek treats the fragments in the order in which they appear in Peter, and the Peter number given in our text will therefore enable the reader to find Lebek's discussion without difficulty.

[24] Just as he refuses to accept as poetic anything except usages which occur in republican verse and do not occur in republican prose (cf. Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 207–9). Note also Lebek's treatment of Turpilius (d. 103) and Accius (170–c.86) as contemporaries of Quadrigarius and Sisenna.

[25] He talks (*Verba prisca*, 261) of 'die umgangssprachliche, familiäre oder vulgäre Ausdruckssphäre'.

[26] In some cases, of course, the expression is one that Cicero and Caesar would not have had occasion to use.

[27] Cf. Briscoe, *Comm.* I. 15–16; Oakley, *Comm.* I. 144.

[28] That is not to deny the possibility that such a usage was in fact taken by a historian from earlier verse.

lists of such usages is not totally pointless. First, Horace says that Roman writers had always been free to invent new words and talks of Ennius and Cato enriching the Latin language with neologisms:[29] it is likely that Cato's successors in historiography followed his practice.[30] Second, despite the uncertainty about any given usage, when, as in the case of Claudius Quadrigarius and Sisenna, the number of such usages occurring for the first time in the author in question is high, it is likely that a proportion of them are indeed coinages. It is not an objection that the number of such usages in Quadrigarius and Sisenna is merely a function of the large number of citations from those two historians by Aulus Gellius and Nonius respectively: for it was precisely the presence of unusual vocabulary that led Gellius to show so much interest in Quadrigarius and Nonius (or his source) to make lists of words found in books 3 and 4 of Sisenna.[31]

In discussing the successors of Cato we refer to all the evidence in the case of those writers for whom there are only a few verbatim citations; we do not, however, mention usages which occur first in Coelius, Quadrigarius, or Sisenna (the last two are contemporary with the early Cicero), but are found more than once in Cicero and Caesar.

3.4. Cato[32]

It is disputed whether Cato revised his speeches for publication and saw himself as creating oratory as a conscious literary genre (in any case, he clearly took trouble over what he said), but as far as historiography is concerned there is no such doubt. And since he included some of his own speeches in the *Origines*,[33] no clear distinction can be drawn between his oratory and his history.[34] That is not to say, though, that Cato created historical narrative out of nothing. Generals had long sent reports to the senate and set up dedicatory inscriptions recording their achievements (cf. Livy 40.51.5–6, 41.28.8–9), and features of these can be seen in the military narrative at Plautus *Amph.* 186–261, itself containing what were archaisms for Plautus (cf. Livy 40.51.5–6; 41.28.8–9).[35]

[29] *ars* 46–59. The vast majority were compounds, and some may not have struck those who encountered them as particularly 'new' (we are indebted to Jim Adams for this point). On the very large number of such words in early Latin, greatly reduced by the Ciceronian period, see Rosén, *Latine loqui* (n. 15), 41–84.

[30] On Fronto 56 see 1. 24–5, 28.

[31] It should be observed that in a few instances usages which do not occur earlier are found in two writers whose chronological relationship to each other cannot be determined (*longe* = *longitudine* in Coelius 15 F11 and Lucilius 114 Marx, *artificiose* in Asellio 20 F9 and Rutilius 21 F1, *pilatim* in Asellio 20 F15 and Scaurus 18 F7, *scutum proicere* in Quadrigarius 24 F6 and Sisenna 26 F7, *funditor* in Quadrigarius 24 F83 and Sisenna 26 F51, *nerminare* in Quadrigarius 24 F49 and Pomponius *Atell.* 56, *festinatim* in Sisenna 26 F117 and Pomponius *Atell.* 13, *suffragare* in Sisenna 26 F135 and Pomponius *Atell.* 106), *testa* in Sisenna 26 F18 and *rhet. Her.* 4.9, *pernici* (gen. sing.) in Sisenna 26 F128 and Cicero *Sex. Rosc.* 131.

[32] On the language of Cato see R. Till, *Die Sprache Catos* (Philologus Supplementband 28.2 (1935)) = *La lingua di Catone*, tr. C. de Meo (Rome, 1968); we cite the latter.

[33] Cato 5 F87–93 (the speech in defence of the Rhodians), 104–7 (the speech against Ser. Sulpicius Galba).

[34] The *De agri cultura*, being essentially a technical treatise, falls into a different category.

[35] Cf. E. Fraenkel, *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), 226–31, 332–5, 428–9 = *Plautine Elements in Plautus* (*Plautinisches im Plautus*), tr. T. Dreikovsky and F. Muecke (Oxford, 2007), 161–5, 236–8, 414–15; Adams, *ALLP*, 73–4; Briscoe, *Comm.* 3, 169.

The structure and general character of Cato's prose emerge from F76, the fragment concerning the exploits of a military tribune during the First Punic War,[36] and F87–93, the extracts from the Rhodian speech. Badian[37] talks, with particular reference to the former, of the sentence structure being 'rudimentary and monotonous, subordination slight', while Leeman[38] commented on 'endless repetitions of the cases of *is* and of *-que*, which co-ordinate hypotactical thoughts of all kinds'.[39]

With regard to the Rhodian speech, citing the first sentence of F87, *scio solere plerisque hominibus rebus secundis atque prolixis atque prosperis animum excellere atque superbiam atque ferociam augescere*[40] *atque crescere*, Badian talks of 'pleonastic synonyms', by which he must mean *secundis . . . prolixis . . . prosperis*, *superbiam . . . ferociam*, *augescere . . . crescere*: what is particularly remarkable is that these are linked together with a fivefold use of *atque*, one of which links not a pair of synonyms but the two infinitive clauses (*rebus . . . excellere* and *superbiam . . . crescere*). The passage represents an extreme example of Cato's fondness, in both the speeches and the *Origines*, for the use of *atque*, before both vowels and consonants, as the conjunctive particle.[41] The use of synonyms also allows the effect of assonance, particularly in *augescere . . . crescere*.[42]

The fact that there is no Latin prose literature before Cato makes evaluation of his vocabulary difficult. As we have seen (I. 23), Horace talks of Cato enriching the language by the invention of new words, but Till's list[43] of 163 words which appear for the first time in the fragmentary works of Cato—a far larger number, of course, is found in the *De agri cultura*—is meaningless, being merely a consequence of the loss of much early verse and our ignorance of the spoken language of the time. Fronto[44]

[36] Only the passage explicitly said by Aulus Gellius to be a verbatim citation from Cato (3.7.19), together with the use of *uerruca* for a hillock (3.7.6), can legitimately be taken into consideration, even if one may reasonably suspect that the rest of the non-verbatim paraphrase (3.7.3–17) in fact retains some elements of the original (cf. comm. on 5 F76).

[37] 'Early historians', 10.

[38] *Orationis ratio*, 71.

[39] For further bibliography on the style of the fragment cf. comm. ad loc. On the frequent use of demonstratives to connect clauses and sentences, which we find also in Cato 5 F5, Hemina 6 F35, Piso 9 F29, and Quadrigarius 24 F6, as well as in Plautus and Terence, cf. E. Laughton *Eranos* 49 (1951), 37; E. Fraenkel, ibid. 54–5=*Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome, 1964) 2. 57; J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg, 1936), 119.

[40] It is this to which Badian ('Early historians', 11) is referring when he says 'including inceptives'. There is, in fact, no other example in the fragment, and *augescere* (found also at Ennius *ann.* 466V=495 Sk.) is probably not inceptive (cf. Leumann, 538–9; G. Haverling, *On -sco-verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions* (Göteborg, 2000), 4–6). On the poetic tone of verbs in *-sco* see Langslow (*Medical Latin* (cit. n. 14), 216). Quadrigarius 24 F95 has *congermanescere*, found elsewhere only in Apuleius (with a sexual meaning), and Sisenna 26 F113 *persubhorrescere*, a hapax.

[41] Cf. Astin, *Cato*, 147. Plautus also used *atque* before consonants in couplings which linked near-synonyms or were alliterative; cf. *Bacch.* 763, *Cas.* 382, 402, *Cist.* 10, *Curc.* 649, *Men.* 829, *Mil.* 10.

[42] Alliteration and assonance continued to be an obvious way of creating an effect, as can be seen particularly in Quadrigarius and Sisenna. But Santini (*Emina*, 67–8) goes too far in finding examples in Hemina 6 F13, 24, 25, 28, 35, and 43, though he is probably right to do so in F14. In general see the cautionary remarks of Goodyear (*Comm.* 2. 336–41). For such effects in ritual language see D. R. Langslow, *ALLP* 290–2.

[43] *La lingua di Catone*, 78–90.

[44] 56; see n. 30. The fact that Fronto refers to Cato as an *orator* does not mean that his remarks do not apply to the *Origines*.

wrote of the care which Cato took in searching for vocabulary (*quaerendi*). While this does not exclude neologisms, the implication is that Cato took words from earlier writers, that is, from poets. Till[45] listed a number of such items, but they are to be seen as the result of Cato's lexicological search, not as words chosen for being poetic. Thus the fact that *inclitissimae* in F76 is an 'epic and tragic word',[46] much favoured by later historians as such,[47] does not mean that Cato used it in his account of the exploits of the military tribune for that reason. It is there preceded by *claritudinis*, a word also found in F28 *atque in excelsissimam claritudinem sublimauit*. As Badian observed ('Early historians', 10), *sublimare* is used by Ennius, and since both fragments have a marked trochaic rhythm (though neither forms a continuous piece of trochaic verse), one might expect to find *claritudo* in early verse. In fact it occurs first in Cato, next in Sisenna 26 F15, and not at all in Latin verse of any period.

A writer of any age can, in principle, use words which were obsolete at his time[48] just because they were so obsolete, but it is impossible to identify any usages of Cato, found in the poets or not, which fall into this category.[49] It is better to see Cato, as Fronto implies, as just seeking the means to write impressively, be it by neologizing or by using words he found in poetry, or, perhaps, words, not used by the poets, which had gone out of use.

3.5. L. Cassius Hemina, Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus, L. Calpurnius Piso

The small surviving amount of the prose of Cassius Hemina, Cato's immediate successor,[50] makes it difficult to say much about his style. As has been observed,[51] 6 F17 (Numa's provision that scaleless fish should not be used for sacrifices) exhibits sentence structure of a complexity unparalleled either in Cato or in any other second-century writer, while F35 combines a terse narrative style with a series of accusative and infinitives.[52] He will, like Cato, have taken trouble over vocabulary, without conspicuously seeking for archaisms.[53] At F30 (*in campo Tiburte ubi hordeum demessuerunt*) Hemina adopted the language, including the word order, of Cato 5 F40 (*in campo Tiburti ubi hordeum demessuit, idem in montibus serit, ubi hordeum idem iterum metit*).[54]

[45] Till, *La lingua di Catone*, 38–46.

[46] Badian, 'Early historians', 10.

[47] Cf. Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 494–5.

[48] Cf. E. Fraenkel, *RE* Suppl. 6, 438, concerning Livius Andronicus and Naevius, and I. 22–3.

[49] The items listed by Till (*La lingua di Catone*, 16–33) under the heading 'L'elemento arcaico' are those which were archaic for the generation of Cicero. For colloquialisms in Cato, cf. Briscoe in E. Dickey, A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, 2010), 154–60.

[50] On the date of Hemina see I. 220–1.

[51] Leeman, *Orationis ratio*, 72; cf. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 76.

[52] Scholz's description (*Hermes* 117 (1989), 179) of 6 F17 and 35 as clumsy shows a lack of perspective (cf. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 77, talking of 'gaucherie' in F35). See also comm. on F14.

[53] See Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 211–13. At 6 F38 *humanitus*, found before Hemina in Ennius and Terence, may have the sense of 'on the part of humans', not otherwise attested before late Latin; cf. *TLL* 6.3.3097.81–3.

[54] See further n. 42; equally dubious are Santini's claims (l.c.) to discern the influence of official and para-official texts on Hemina's style (similarly Leeman, *Orationis ratio*, 72, 87).

The sole certain[55] verbatim fragment of the history of Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8 F1) has *agrum macerrimum litorosissimumque*: *macer* was used of soil in Cato *agr.* 6.2[56] (it is later common in agricultural writers), *litorosus* occurs elsewhere only in the elder Pliny. It may be that Servilianus too was seeking impressive vocabulary, taking *macer* from Cato and coining *litorosus*.[57]

There are only six verbatim fragments of L. Calpurnius Piso: 9 F10, 17, 20, 21, 29, 38.[58] Three of them, F17 *allicuit*, 20 *Tarquinio nomine esset*, and 21 *ignosciturum*, all unparalleled in classical Latin, are cited for matters of grammar; F10, 20, and 29 come from Aulus Gellius, and since he does not cite Piso for his vocabulary, and the only attention given to Piso's vocabulary by anyone else is Cicero's interest in his use of the word *penis* in F42, it is a reasonable inference that he constituted an exception in not making a particular effort in that regard.[59] In citing F10 and 29 Gellius talks of Piso writing *simplicissima suauitate et rei et orationis* (10) and of *res perquam pure et uenuste narrata* (29). He is speaking of the very simple sentence structure, which Cicero regarded as *exilis* ('lacking body'),[60] but which he admired.

3.6. C. Fannius and Cn. Gellius

As we have seen, Badian thought that Fannius was the first writer to archaize deliberately, creating 'the custom of the *genre*' (above, n. 10). That is a lot to build on four verbatim fragments, one of which (12 F3) concerns the form of a geographical name. Badian was influenced principally by *biber* as the infinitive of *bibo* in F2, which had also been used by Cato (5 F120). Fannius may have taken it from Cato, but if he did, his decision derives from a search for the unusual, not from a desire to imitate the first writer of history in Latin. It may be, however, that at least in combination with *dare*, *biber* was an accepted form at his time.[61] For the rest, *inpraesentiarum* (F1) occurs at Cato *agr.* 144.4, but also in *rhet. Her.* and Nepos, while, as we have seen, *apisci* used passively may have been a current usage (see n. 55).

We come next to Cn. Gellius,[62] probably to be identified with the *monetalis* of 138. Of the thirteen verbatim fragments, no fewer than ten are cited by Charisius for their morphological interest, and seven of these are cases of feminine plurals in *-abus*.[63]

[55] On the attribution of 8 F4 see comm. ad loc. It has *apisci* used passively, found also in Fannius 12 F7; the usage occurs at Plautus *Trin.* 367, but could have been current in the second half of the second century.

[56] Also of a vine at *agr.* 37.3.

[57] The jejune evidence for the Latin version of Fabius Pictor (see I. 163–6), if it indeed belongs to this period, contains nothing of value for the present purpose.

[58] See the brief remarks of G. Forsythe, *Piso*, 36–8. The *oratio recta* attributed to C. Furius Cresimus in 9 F35 cannot safely be taken as a verbatim citation.

[59] *occiput* in 9 F38, if it is what Piso wrote, may well not have been seen as archaic at his time; see Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 214; Oakley *Comm.* I. 438–9. 9 F29, though it is not cited for this reason, contains *ad collegam uenisse uisere aegrotum*; such infinitives to express purpose after verbs of motion are common in verse from Ennius onwards, but in prose the only other occurrences in republican Latin are Coelius 15 F11 and two passages of Varro *rust.* (cf. Kühner-Stegmann I. 680–1, Hofmann-Szantyr 344–5; Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 220) quotes only passages with *mittere*). Either Piso or Coelius may have been influenced by the usage of the other (they may well have been writing at around the same time).

[60] *leg.* 1.6 (=GT2).

[61] Cf. Titinius *com.* 78, Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 215. On such forms cf. Leumann, 92.

[62] There are no verbatim fragments of C. Sempronius Tuditanus.

[63] For what follows see esp. Leumann, 422.

Such forms were regarded by grammarians as justified when it was necessary to make it clear that a feminine was meant.[64] In early Latin, however, they occur when this was not the case,[65] and in Gellius all but *deabus* fall into this category. Whether Gellius' predilection for them was a deliberate archaism[66] or simply an unusual affectation is not clear. Lebek's claim (*Verba prisca*, 216) that he took them from the living language, perhaps unconsciously, is implausible.

In 14 F9 Gellius uses *ossum* rather than *os* for 'bone', in F32–3 *regerum* and *lapiderum* rather than *regum* and *lapidum* as the genitive plural of *rex* and *lapis* respectively, and in F34 *forum* rather than *forus* for 'ship's gangway'. The first of these, found also in Accius (*carm. frg.* 4), may have been a form in use in Gellius' time,[67] the others examples of the desire for morphological innovation manifested in the use of forms in *-abus*. But Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 217) is right to observe that, given the length of Gellius' history (see I. 253–4), we should beware of taking these fragments as characteristic of the work as a whole.[68]

The prayer of Hersilia (F5), the one continuous piece of Gellius' prose preserved, consists of a single sentence containing four subordinate clauses, the first depending on *obsecro*,[69] the second causal, depending on the first, the third consecutive, depending on the second, the fourth relative, depending on the object of the third. The first and third clauses both begin with *uti*, which, as the infinitive of *utor*, is also the last word of the first. This simple and perfectly clear piece of Latin was no doubt intended by Gellius as a deliberate evocation of prayer formulae.[70]

3.7. L. Coelius Antipater

Cicero regarded the style of Coelius Antipater as representing a considerable improvement on his predecessors.[71] Unfortunately there is not a verbatim fragment of sufficient length to enable us to test Cicero's judgement.[72]

[64] Thus Charisius 67–8 and Priscian *GL* 2.294, citing Hemina 6 F33.

[65] Livius Andronicus *carm. fr.* 37, Cato *agr.* 152, Hemina 6 F33 (see comm. ad loc.); we also find masculines in *-bus* at Ennius *ann.* 30V, Plaut. *Curc.* 506, *Mil.* 74 and Pompon. *Atell.* 70.

[66] When Fraenkel (*JRS* 41 (1951), 193=*Kleine Beiträge* (cit. n. 39) 2. 133) described F10–11 *portabus* and *oleabus* as 'pseudoarchaisms', he meant that Gellius was using an archaic form, but that there were no previous examples of it for *porta* and *olea*.

[67] Cf. Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 216. It is unclear whether *deliquium* and *deli(n)quio* for 'eclipse' (14 F35–6) are innovations or words in current use (thus Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 217). F9 *caluaria* (for *calua*) occurs in a fragment of Varro and nowhere else in republican and Augustan Latin.

[68] *sedauit* in 14 F28 is an example of the not uncommon phenomenon of an active verb being used reflexively; cf. Kühner–Stegmann 1. 91–3; Hofmann–Szantyr 395–6; L. Feltenius, *Intransitivizations in Latin* (Uppsala, 1977), 36. Lebek's apparent implication (*Verba prisca*, 216) that Gellius intended it as a colloquialism is misleading.

[69] We adopt Hertz's *da, te* for the MSS *date*.

[70] See the material collected by G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus* (Giessen, 1909); Hersilia's prayer is at p. 43 no. 93. Note the alliteration in *propriis et prosperis, coniugis consilio contigit*, and *posteros patriae pararent* (cf. n. 42). *integra* of a virgin occurs elsewhere in republican and Augustan Latin at Plaut. *Truc.* 821, Ter. *Hec.* 150, Catull. 61.36 and Hor. *carm.* 3.4.70; it is not found again in prose before Sen. *contr.* 1.2.20. It is conceivable that Gellius took it from Ennius, who seems also to have related the episode (cf. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968), 134–6; *Ennius*, 245–7).

[71] *de orat.* 2.54 (=GT1), *leg.* 1.6 (=GT2), *Brut.* 102.

[72] Though note how at 15 F22 Coelius has altered Cato's brusque paratactic imperative plus future indicative (5 F78) to a conditional sentence.

When Fronto[73] wrote that of the poets Ennius devoted the greatest effort to the search for vocabulary, and that Coelius emulated him assiduously, he meant, of course, that Coelius, like Ennius, paid a great deal of attention to vocabulary, not necessarily that he imitated that of Ennius. It is with Coelius, though, that the clash between the conceptions of Badian and Lebek can be seen at its sharpest.[74]

What emerges from study of the evidence[75] is that Coelius employed words or usages which (i) are unique: 15 F20 *tractare*='drag out', F21 *dissentior*, F29 *discessus* active*, F43 *ante . . . ferri* in tmesis, F44 *exfundare*,[76] F55 *bellosus*, F56 *nucerum* genitive plural (cf. Gellius 14 F32–3 (I. 27)), F66 *depeculari* passive*; (ii) occur first in or contemporaneously with Coelius, and not in Cicero or Caesar (in several cases only in his successors who were probably imitating him): F6 *dedicare*='indicate', F11 *longe=longitudine* (cf. n. 31), F16 *dextimus*, F24 *nullae* dative, F28 *dubitatim* (Sisenna 26 F69), F41 *congenuclare* (Sisenna 26 F11), F42 *indulgitas* (Sisenna 26 F17), F59 *delinquere*='fail', 'be lacking' (Tubero 38 F14); (iii) occur before Coelius, but not, or very rarely, in Cicero or Caesar: F2–3 *alii* genitive, F2 *antequam* with pluperfect in positive clause, F4 passive form of *posse* with passive infinitive (see above, I. 21), F9 verb of motion + infinitive to express purpose (see above I. 26 n. 59), F22 *diequinti*, clearly taken from Cato 5 F78, F30 *finis* feminine, F34 *oportet* in plural, *morbosus*, F40 *paucies*, F43 *solui* as perfect of *soleo*, F45 *topper*, F47 *tempestas*='time', F62 *arbitror* passive*.[77]

While some of the items listed under (i) and (ii) may have been innovations, and some of those under (iii) usages deliberately taken from earlier literature, there is no reason to think that in the case of *arbitror*, *alii*, the passive form of *posse*, and *dedicare* we are not dealing with usages which were current in the Latin of the last third of the second century. In any case, Coelius was not observing what had become the rules of Latin historiography: he was, as Fronto indicates, searching for appropriate vocabulary in order to write as impressively as he could.

3.8. Sempronius Asellio and the autobiographers

Cicero (*leg.* 1.6=GT2) thought that Sempronius Asellio, whose history went down to at least 91 (20 F11; see I. 276), marked a step backwards from Coelius. The

[73] 56; cf. I. 24–5. At 134 (=GT5) Fronto says that Cato's words were *multiiuga*, Coelius' *singula*. He probably meant that Coelius avoided the accumulation of epithets which we have noted in 5 F87 (I. 24): there is no justification for Badian's statement ('Early historians', 33 n. 78) that *multiiugus* 'ought to mean compound words'.

[74] For Badian see n. 10 (his categories ('Early historians', 33 n. 77) 'odd features of accidence and construction' and 'solemn and unusual words or unusual uses of common words' are confused and misleading). Lebek, (*Verba prisca*, 223) held that there was only one archaism (15 F45 *topper*), but admitted that 15 F43 *auctor* might derive from Ennius.

[75] See Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 217–23. Words marked with an asterisk in what follows are not discussed by Lebek.

[76] It is not certain that the fragment belongs to Coelius.

[77] We exclude 15 F9 *celox*, found in Ennius, Plautus, Turpilius, Varro *Men.*, and three times in Livy, since the word is technical and the distribution—its use being determined by the subject matter—therefore not significant. F55 *auctor* and 68 *maior* (the attribution to Coelius is uncertain) remained choice, but occur in Cicero; cf. Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 245–6; 384–5.

two fragments from his preface (20 F1–2) exhibit a sentence structure of some complexity: Cicero, however, was presumably referring to Asellio's narrative, which was doubtless much plainer. F1 contains two instances of resumptive *is*, a colloquialism common in early Latin, though found occasionally in the late republic.[78] Probable archaisms occur at F5 *glisceretur*[79] and F8 *uirile secus*.[80] F2 *iterare*='say' occurs elsewhere only in (mainly early) verse.[81] Not found before Asellio are F4 *plerum* for *plerumque*, F6 *necessitudo*='compulsion', F10 *facundiosus* (hapax), F11 *crepidarius* (hapax[82]), and F12 *secus*=*post*. F9 *artificiose*, found several times (as both adjective and adverb) in *rhet. Her.* and Cicero's rhetorical and philosophical works, occurs contemporaneously in Rutilius Rufus 21 F1, F15 *pilatim* in Aemilius Scaurus 18 F7.

The verbatim fragments of Scaurus exhibit instances of the passive forms of *posse* (18 F4),[83] what appears to be the only example of *fruor* with the genitive (F2),[84] and the earliest one of the participle (-)*fictus* (F6), rather than (-)*fixus*, even though it is the original form.[85]

Rutilius, in addition to *artificiose*, uses *lectica* to mean 'mattress of straw' (21 F7): its normal meaning 'litter' occurs first in a speech of Gaius Gracchus (*or. frg.* 49).[86]

There are no verbatim fragments of Q. Lutatius Catulus. Aulus Gellius cites verbatim two passages of the autobiography of Sulla (22 F2, 3), the second of which exhibits a complex, but tight, sentence structure. The only other verbatim fragment (F5) is cited for the indeclinable future participle; this occurs also in both Quadrigarius (24 F43, 81) and Antias (25 F14), and since the latter, like Sulla, evinced little interest from the grammarians, it is a reasonable inference that it was an accepted usage at the time.[87]

3.9. Q. Claudius Quadrigarius

The large number of verbatim citations from Quadrigarius, together with the fact that five (24 F6, 41, 57, 83, 84)[88] are passages of some length, means that we have a considerable body of evidence for evaluating his language and style.[89]

[78] Cf. Kühner–Stegmann 1. 625; Hofmann–Szantyr 187; Adams–Mayer in iidem (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999), 6). At Quadrigarius 24 F3 the usage is regular, since a relative clause intervenes.

[79] See Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 516–17.

[80] See Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 151, where, however, passages without *ac/et muliebre* are omitted; Plaut. *Rud.* 107 has *uirile sexus* used in the same way. The idiom occurs also at Sisenna 26 F90.

[81] *TLL* 7.2.549.9 ff.

[82] *TLL* 4.1167.24 ff. wrongly cite the passage of Aulus Gellius (13.22.7–8) which quotes the fragment as evidence for *crepidarius* as a noun.

[83] See I. 21, 28.

[84] Though it may be that an ablative (or conceivably an accusative) has been lost (Charisius cites the fragment for the form *uestigalium*); cf. *TLL* 6.1.1424.4–5.

[85] Cf. Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 226; Leumann, 616.

[86] 21 F9 presents the first instance of *ostentare* in prose, found frequently in early verse, but common in Cicero and Caesar. The fragment of a speech which Diomedes, immediately following F9, appears to assign to Rutilius in fact belongs to Cato (*orat.* 209). On F5 *orbi terrarum* see comm. ad loc.

[87] See commentary on Quadrigarius 24 F43.

[88] There is no reason to regard F12P (Gell. 9.11) as a fragment of Quadrigarius. See I. 292.

[89] It is a reflection of the amount of evidence that Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 227–61) devoted considerably more space to Claudius than to any other historian. See also Badian, 'Early historians', 20.

Aulus Gellius was clearly fascinated by Claudius. Of the thirty-four fragments cited from or assignable to book 1, twenty come from Gellius 17.2.[90] He found much of linguistic interest in Claudius, and admired his plain style, quoting Fronto as calling him *uirum modesti atque puri et prope cotidiani sermonis* ('a man of restrained and plain and almost everyday language')[91] and prefacing his citation of F6 by saying that it was written *purissime atque inlustrissime simplicique et incompta orationis antiquae suauitate* ('with the greatest plainness and clarity, and with the straightforward and unadorned charm of old-fashioned prose').[92]

Claudius' history is contemporary with the early works of Cicero (and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*), and the fragments contain a large number of instances of vocabulary, morphology, and syntax which are absent or virtually absent from Cicero and Caesar. Some are to be found in earlier Latin, others make their first or only appearance in Claudius.[93]

The following are found before Claudius: 24 F6 *pausa*, *extemplo*, *cum uoce maxima*, *genere gnatus* (also F10), *scuto scutum*, *subuertere*, F10 *adprime*, F15 *arrabo*, F20 *frunisci*, F22 *occasus* used actively, F28 *sanctitudo*, F33, F47 passive of *posse* with passive infinitive, F36 *propere*, F38 *ignauiter*, F39 *desubito*,[94] F40 *amplexare*, F41 *inimiciter*, F43, F81 indeclinable future participle in *oratio obliqua*, F45 *noctu*, F46 *delectare*='entice', F54 *cohorto* active, F61 *aliquantisper*, *promouere*='make progress', F76–7 *prior* neuter,[95] F79 *grundire*, imperfect in *-ibam*, F83 interrogative clause preceding *interest*, *spargere*='discharge', F90 *auariter*.

The following occur for the first or only time in Claudius: 24 F2 *commutatio*='communication', F3 *cumprime*, *exsuperabilis* used actively, *seruare a*, F4 *uiaticum*='resources', F6 *facies* gen. (also F31), *exsertare*, *perdolitum est*, *ponti* abl., *cantabundus*, *haurire*='pierce', *icti* genitive, *sanguinulentus*,[96] F7 *exspolari*, F14 *prouolare*, F17 *inlatebrare*, F19 *facii* gen., F21 *copiari*, F23 *in medium relinquere*, F26 *diurnare*, F27 *consermonari*, F30 *otium* plural, F31 *arboretum*, F32 *galearis*, F37 *offendere* with both direct object and accusative and infinitive, F40 *comprehensare*, F41 *ciuitates*='the world', F48 *praeclariter*,[97] F51 *alternatim*, F52 *urguere*=*insistere*, F55 *recordare* active, F59, F72 *quin* for *ut*, F62 *habentia*, F73 *aspicari*, F74 *murmurari* deponent, F80 *hinnibundus*, F83 *defendere a*='keep away from', F84 *tempore magno*=*diu*, F89 *cum partim* with abl. and acc. in apposition, F90 *misericorditer*, F95 *congermanescere*, *facere exemplum*+gen., F96 *pluuia imber*, F98 *interitus* used actively.

[90] Another six come from elsewhere in Gellius.

[91] Gell. 13.29.2; *cotidianus* has the sense of 'colloquial', 'conversational'; cf. Cic. *orat.* 109; Quint. *inst.* 11.1.6.

[92] For other value-judgements by Gellius see 15.1.4; 17.2.3, 6, 10, 23, 26.

[93] On a number of occasions Lebek rightly criticizes Wölfflin (*ALLG* 15 (1908), 10–22 or Zimmerer, *Quadrigarius*) for categorizing usages as poeticisms (mainly Wölfflin) or archaisms (Zimmerer). It should be said that Zimmerer's discussion of Claudius' language and style (88–127), though diffuse and hard to use, contains a number of perceptive remarks; in particular she well emphasizes the number of places where Claudius has introduced deliberate stylistic effects.

[94] There is no justification for Lebek's claim (*Verba prisca*, 245) that when Cicero used *desubito* at *rep.* 6.2 he was imitating the speech of an earlier generation.

[95] This, occurring also in Antias 25 F11, could have been an accepted usage in the Sullan period (Badian ('Early historians', 36 n. 111) declares that 'it must surely have been quite intolerable by the time of Cicero').

[96] On F6 §16 *scuto proiecto* cf. n. 31.

[97] On F49 *uerminare* see n. 31.

Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 260) states that there is not a single archaism or poeticism in Claudius. Rather, he believes, both in the case of the usages which are found before him[98] and in many of those which are not,[99] Claudius was drawing on the colloquial Latin of his time. As we have seen,[100] this view is based on the false assumption that the occurrence of a usage found in both Claudius and late Latin is proof of its continued existence in the spoken language, and it is much more likely that he was deliberately seeking to write in the way that history had been written before him. In the case of usages which do not occur before Claudius, there are only two instances, F7 *cumprime*, found in Cassius Felix in the sense 'for the first time', and F30 *arboretum* (in fact a technical term), which survives in Romance, where Lebek can produce what he regards as evidence that they were or may have been taken from the spoken language. The probability is that Claudius neologized and used words in new senses, and the evidence suggests that he did so to a far greater degree than any of his predecessors.

The character of Claudius' prose can be judged only from the longer fragments, above all from F6, the combat of Manlius and the Gaul.

Oakley (*Comm.* 2. 120–1) complains of the lack of variation,[101] particularly with regard to word order, though he himself notes the chiasmus in §7 *nudus praeter scutum et gladios duos, torque et armillis decoratus*,[102] and we may add *pugnae facta pausa est* in §9[103] and the placing of *maxima* and *magno* after *uoce* and *metu* respectively in §§10 and 15.[104]

The structure is simple, with little subordination.[105] As Albrecht says (n. 101), 'clauses are connected by means of demonstratives, relatives, and parataxis, in so far as there is any connection at all'. It is this which Gellius admired as old-fashioned, and which Cicero regarded as the major fault of historical writing as it existed before his time (see above, I. 20). Combined with this is a certain awkwardness and inconcinnity. Thus at F6 §14 *is, ut dico, processit*, Claudius has not previously said that Manlius came forward, and the parenthesis serves merely for emphasis.[106] At F6 §16 *ut ante dixi* refers back to §§7 and 14 and *ita* does not look forward to the contrast between *Gallus* and *Manlius*: it is either to be taken with *ut* or is merely resumptive.

[98] Had he not missed it, Lebek would have explained F6 *cum uoce maxima* in this way: this instrumental use of *cum* occurs in Cato, Accius, and late Latin; cf. Kühner–Stegmann 1. 510; Courtney, *ALP*, 147.

[99] This appears to be Lebek's position: he is not explicit.

[100] I. 22–3. Though he does not himself use the argument, Lebek's view might appear to be supported by the description of Claudius as *uirum . . . prope cotidiani sermonis* (see I. 30). Fronto and Gellius, however, could not have known what was and what was not part of the spoken language in the 80s and 70s BC.

[101] M. von Albrecht (*Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius* (Leeds, 1989), 93) is more impressed by the variation that he finds (e.g. §16 *disciplina . . . ars*, 16–17 *percussit . . . percutit*, 17–18 *subuertit . . . euertit*). Schibel (*Sprachbehandlung und Darstellungsweise in römischer Prosa* (Amsterdam, 1971), 27) notes the variations on a root in §17 *successit . . . concessu . . . recessit* and 17–18 *incidit . . . praecidit*.

[102] For other examples of chiasmus in the fragments see Zimmerer, *Quadrigarius*, 115–16, citing F20, 21, 59, 84, 90.

[103] For the separation of *facta* and *est* cf. Adams, *Wackernagel's Law and the Placing of the Copula* esse *in Classical Latin* (Cambridge, 1994), 42.

[104] See Courtney, *ALP*, 148. On *maxime* in §8 see I. 32.

[105] Cf. Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 122.

[106] Cf. Courtney, *ALP*, 148.

Despite this, Claudius continues, contrasting *Gallus sua disciplina* and *Manlius animo magis quam arte confisus*, as if he had intended *ita* to look forward, and, what is more, the second limb of his contrast 'drifts from description to narrative'.[107] Similarly in F14 *propinqui* is the subject of the subordinate, *parentes* of the main clause; in F33 Claudius writes *putaretur uictoria esse*, when *uictoria esset* would have sufficed; in F41 *neue* apparently depends on *negauimus*, but is in fact an ellipse for *et monuimus ne*; in F46 *hostibus* is followed by *eum hostem*, while *obpugnare* is dependent on *simulare*, *delectare* co-ordinate with it; in F57 we expect *et quod* to be introducing a second reason for Fabius' unwillingness to dismount, when in fact it introduces a causal clause going with the second main clause; in F95 *eorum* and *illis* do not have the same reference (the treatment of the former will make it clear that the people being addressed are joining the latter), though it would be no less awkward if they did.

Such things may also have appeared to Fronto to be characteristic of *sermo cotidianus* (cf. n. 91). One wonders, though, whether they were a deliberate affectation rather than mere artlessness, an attempt to reproduce the characteristics of earlier historians. Similar considerations may apply to dislocations of word order which appear to serve no purpose, as with F6 §8 *maxime*, F39 *ipsorum*, and F40 *conprehensare*.

A consequence of all this is that it is quite unjustified to emend the transmitted text because it presents a usage which is unparalleled or appears 'surprising' or 'weak'.[108] Examples of readings assailed by such conjectures are F3 *exsuperabilem*, F6 §14 *ut dico* (discussed above), §17 *concessu*, F8 *ex uictoria inerti*, F37 *loca munita res omnes habere*, F46 (see above), F47 *adorti essent*, F95 (see above) *facite exempla eorum*, F96 *pluuia imbri*, F97 *populare* active.

3.10. Valerius Antias

There are only nine verbatim fragments of Valerius Antias.[109] Both the small number and their content indicate that he made no effort to employ archaic usages or to neologize. Badian (l.c., n. 109) unjustifiably saw archaisms in 25 F11 *prior* neuter (see n. 95) and the forms *speponderant* (F13), *peposcit* (F15), and *descendidit* (F17).[110] *nouissime* is attested in F10 and 12: *nouissimus*, according to Varro (*ling.* 6.59), was a neologism, widely used in the Ciceronian period (several times by Cicero's correspondents), but avoided by Cicero himself (Gell. 10.21.1). F14 is an example of the indeclinable future participle (see I. 29), while F16 is cited for *adultus* as the participle of *adoleo* (neither it nor any other form occurs elsewhere: *TLL* 1.793–4).

[107] Cf. Courtney, *ALP*, 148.

[108] Thus Courtney (*ALP* 147, 149) on F6 §§8 *maxime* ('surprisingly prominent position') and 17 *usquam* ('seems a little weak').

[109] It cannot be assumed that the *oratio recta* in 25 F8 reproduces the text of Antias, as Badian ('Early historians', 36 n. 111) appears to think. Leeman (*Orationis ratio*, 82) analysed the Latin of Orosius in F66b as if it was that of Antias.

[110] *spepondi* and *peposci* were the original forms, but Gellius, who cites the fragments, says that the former was used by Cicero and Caesar (it can be seen as a legal archaism; cf. Adams, *ZPE* 82 (1990), 244). The statement by Leumann, 586) that *depeposcit* occurs at *res gest. diu. Aug.* 25.2 is erroneous. *descendidi*, for which Gellius also cites Laberius, was formed on the analogy of compounds of *dare* (Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 262).

3.11. L. Cornelius Sisenna

Cicero[111] regarded Sisenna as far superior to all other historical writers, though well short of the attainable peak; he says (*leg.* 1.7) that Sisenna seemed to have read no Greek historian other than Clitarchus and to have had the sole aim of imitating him. The latter comment probably refers to both the content and the style of Sisenna's work: Clitarchus was noted for both his exaggerated descriptions and his inflated style.[112] Similarly, Fronto (134 (=GT5)), who might have been expected to admire Sisenna's archaizing (see below), thought he was long-winded.

The fact that Nonius, or his source, had and made full use of a text of Sisenna's third and fourth books (see I. 94, 310) means that we have a great deal of evidence for Sisenna's linguistic usages. All the fragments preserved by Nonius, however, are extremely short, and no other writer comes to our rescue with a passage long enough to enable us to form a judgement about the structure of Sisenna's prose.[113] What the fragments do show is that Sisenna, like Quadrigarius, wrote Latin which was markedly different from that of the early Cicero and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

The following usages, found in earlier writers, are absent or virtually absent from Cicero and Caesar.[114] 26 F 11 *congenuclare*, F15 *claritudo*, *fortassean*, F19 *indulgitas*, F21 *immissa* for *demissa*, F24 *manipulatim*, F25 *confodere* as an agricultural term, F27, F113 *occipere*, F32 *mittere*=*excludere*, F34, F107 *protelare*, F43–4 *potior*+accusative,[115] F57 *proloquor*, F63 *amoliri*, F64 *concubia nocte*, F69 *dubitatim*, F77 *integrare* for *redintegrare*, F79 *diui*, F87 *finis* feminine, F89 *fluuia*, F90 *uirile ac muliebre secus*,[116] F92 *malum publicum*, F93 *componere*=*praeparare*, F97 *constare*='stand together', F104 *necessitudo*='compulsion' (cf. n. 80), F113 *caecos fluctus prouoluere*, F114 *labrum*='edge, extremity', *innoxius*, F116 *suum* genitive plural, F118 *utor*+accusative, F120 *proris*, F133 *stare*=*plenum est*, F137 *properatim*.

The following occur for the first or only time in Sisenna. F3 *iuxtim* as a preposition, F4, F109 *protinus* = 'without going anywhere else', F5 *falso*, F7 *proicere* = 'thrust forward' (F84 of speech),[117] F8 *arbor*+name of species, F10 *remulcare*, F12 *agilis*, F13 *adesus*, F30 *sagarius*, F16 *dispalari*, F18 *fragmen*, F20 *in populum producere*, F22 *post principia* as noun, F26 *praefestinatim*, F31 *callere*+acc. and inf., F36 *manualis*, F40, F80 *sonu* ablative, F42 *certare*+dative, F44 *numerus*+gen. of number, F57 *supsedere*+inf., F60, F117 *peditis* nom., acc. plural, F60 *insinuare*+acc., F61 *exhaurire* of alcohol, F66 *centones* and *cilicia* in a naval context, F67 *crebritudo*, F74 *ferus*='uncultivated', F76 *granditas*, F78 *iusso* for *iussu*, F79 *laetiscere*, *supernus*, *permittere*=*praecipitare*, F80 *molimentum*, F84 *proicere* of speech, F86 *certatio* in a

[111] *leg.* 1.7 (=GT2), *Brut.* 228. Cicero's failure to mention Sisenna in the *De oratore*, of course, is due to the need to preserve the illusion created by the dramatic date.

[112] Cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 378–83.

[113] Badian's talk ('Early historians', 26) of 'sound-painting, to produce startling effects' refers to 26 F113. Hyperbaton can be seen in F46, 81, 82, 85, 123, 116.

[114] Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 267–86) admits only two archaisms, *occipere* and *diui*. Cf. Badian, 'Early historians', 26, 38 nn. 144–7.

[115] We include this since it occurs seventeen times in early poetry, even though it is found twice in *rhet. Her.* and twice in the Caesarian corpus.

[116] Perhaps taken by Sisenna from Asellio 20 F8 (see I. 29).

[117] On F141 *scutis proiectis* cf. n. 31.

military context (cf. Quadrigarius 24 F60), F91 *conglobare*, F94 *contendere*='tighten, twist', F99 *uoto damnare*, F102 *expedire*='work free', (also F108) *periclitari*+physical object, F105 *frustrari* used passively, F108 *machinamentum*,[118] F112 *silentium oritur*, F113 *persubhorrescere*, F115 *populabundus* adjective in *-bundus* with direct object, F120 *tragus*, F122 *talentarius*, F125 *catafractes(-a)*, F126 *harpaga*, F129 *celatim*, F130 *saltuatim*, *uellicatim*, F131 *continari*, F134 *sibilu* ablative,[119] F136 *patres familiarum*, F139 *mediterreus*, F141 *carnificari* used passively, F142 *semionustus*.

The probability that a proportion of these words were neologisms is increased by the fact that Sisenna was famous for using unheard-of words in court (Cic. *Brut.* 259–60) and had a penchant for analogy (Varro ap. Gell. 2.25.9; Quint. *inst.* 1.5.13). Gellius, in the passage (12.15) which constitutes F129, 130, 137, 138, notes his fondness for adverbs in *-im*,[120] citing *cursim*, *properatim*,[121] *celatim*, *uellicatim*, *saltuatim*; the lists above contain, in addition, *dubitatim*, *festinatim* (see n. 149), *iuxtim* (though as a preposition), *manipulatim*, *praefestinatim*, and *uicatim*.[122]

3.12. C. Licinius Macer[123]

Cicero (*leg.* 1.7=GT2) was dismissive of Macer; he granted that his *loquacitas* possessed some *argutiae*, but said that it derived from Latin *librarioli*, not Greek learning.[124] The surviving verbatim fragments are all short, and do not allow us to evaluate Cicero's verdict.

27 F4 *luculentus*, found before Macer in Plautus, Terence, and Afranius, occurs several times in Cicero's correspondence and twice in the *Philippics*. F5 *quies* as an adjective occurs otherwise only in Naevius and Apuleius.[125] In F6, a very obscure fragment, *reluere*, which occurs in Caecilius in the sense of 'redeem' (sc. something mortgaged), appears to mean 'cleanse';[126] *lues* (?='contagion') is found before Macer only in the *Carmen Aruale*: it is rare in prose but occurs once in Cicero. F8 *neglegi* perfect is unattested before Macer, and its use by Sallust (*Cat.* 51.24; *Iug.* 40.1)[127] was probably a deliberate imitation. F26 *clipeum* (for *clipeus*) is a form first found in Pomponius, but used several times by Livy in passages of no great moment, while F27 *se contendere* is a hapax. The evidence, limited as it is, suggests that Macer too strove for effect both by taking words from earlier writers and by innovation.

[118] On F117 *festinatim* cf. n. 31.

[119] On F135 *suffragare* cf. n. 31.

[120] See G. Barabino, in *Tetraonyma* (Genoa, 1966), 33–59, and I. 21.

[121] Gellius says that *cursim* and *properatim* are better known (sc. than the others) and he does not need to quote Sisenna; the former is found in Plautus, *rhet. Her.*, Cicero, and Livy, but *properatim* only in Caecilius *com.* 167 and *CIL* 6.25703.

[122] The fragments also contain the common *partim* (F74, 124), *paulatim* (F22) and *statim* (F43, 99).

[123] See Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 287–8. Walt's discussion (*Macer*, 142–8) is largely doxographical.

[124] The text of the second part of Cicero's judgement is corrupt, but there is no doubt that he is talking about the speeches in Macer's history, not Macer as an orator. See I. 330–1.

[125] Lebek (*Verba prisca*, 287) is willing to admit that it was an archaism for Macer, but in n. 53 he canvasses the implausible idea that *quietes* is in fact a noun, the subject of an accusative and infinitive (sc. *milites* is the subject of *uolebant*).

[126] *OLD* classifies the two meanings as different verbs.

[127] Lebek's scepticism (*Verba prisca*, 288) about the reading is unjustified: stemmatics might appear to eliminate it, but it has clearly been altered to the normal form in most MSS.

3.13. The historic present

The following table gives the figures for the occurrence of the perfect and historic present respectively where the author, as far as we can judge, had a choice.[128]

Author	Perfect	Present	Uncertain
Cato	15	1	—
Hemina	5	5	—
Piso	8	3	—
Gellius	2	—	—
Coelius	—	12	1
Asellio	3	—	—
Quadrigarius	38	22	6
Antias	5	—	—
Sisenna	15	54	5
Macer	—	2	1

Obviously these figures must be treated with caution, especially for those authors of whom few verbatim fragments survive (and we must also remember that for many of the fragments of Cato, not being narrative, the issue does not arise). Statistically, though, it is unlikely that the suggestion of a marked preference for the historic present on the part of Coelius and Sisenna, in contrast to Quadrigarius and in marked contrast to Cato, is misleading.

3.14. Prose rhythm

Only in the case of Coelius do we have evidence for an author giving particular attention to prose rhythm. In the passage which constitutes 15 F1 Cicero states that Coelius wrote that only if he could not avoid it would he indulge in obvious dislocation of word order to achieve a better cadence or flow to his prose; in fact, Cicero continues, he did employ such transpositions, and yet still failed 'to fill out and bring his sentences to an end any more appropriately'. The only example of such dislocation in the fragments is 15 F46, where the result is a somewhat imperfect hexameter (see comm. ad loc.); as Leo observed (*GRL* 339 n. 4), we find other pieces of verse in the fragments,[129] something which Cicero held should be avoided (*de orat.* 3.182; *orat.* 187). Elsewhere we have examples of 'Ciceronian' clausulae:[130] it should

[128] When a fragment contains more than one perfect or historic present, each occurrence is counted. 'Uncertain' indicates cases where the forms of the present and the perfect are identical, or where the text is not certain. Historic infinitives are found in Cato (5 F83), Quadrigarius (24 F40, 45, 51), and Sisenna (26 F42, 82). Cf. comm. on Hemina 6 F34 and Sisenna 26 F100 and 111).

[129] See commentary on 15 F4, 16, 17, 42, 55; cf. commentary on Cato 5 F1.

[130] e.g. 15 F62. F2 *Africam missus* (cretic+trochee), F3 *geri putetur* (resolved cretic+trochee, the so-called *esse uideatur* clausula), *arbitrantur* (double trochee); cf. Badian, 'Early Historians', 33 n. 76.

not be assumed, however, that Coelius' notion of desirable rhythmical endings was identical with that of Cicero, whose own practice, notoriously, does not accord with the precepts he offers in the *De oratore* and the *Orator*.[131] The prose rhythm of Sallust and Livy is not that of Cicero.[132]

Similar considerations apply to others of our historians. In his controversial *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos*,[133] as the title indicates, Fraenkel was concerned only with the speeches of Cato, and, therefore, the Rhodian speech (5 F87–93) is the only fragment of the *Origines* which he analyses. 'Ciceronian' clausulae, however, are to be found in the Caedicius fragment (5 F76) as well as in some of the shorter fragments. Leo (*GRL* 330 n. 2) detected such clausulae in a number of the fragments of Hemina (6 F15, 17, 28–30, 33, 37, 43).[134] Norden[135] found prose rhythm in two fragments of Quadrigarius, 24 F80, which he labelled as trochaic, and 24 F91, two cretics separated by a long syllable: the former is not obviously trochaic (*spargentes terram calcibus* is an example of molossus+cretic) and the latter is not a clausula favoured by Cicero. In fact there are a considerable number of Ciceronian clausulae,[136] but again that is not to say that they were deliberate. The situation is no different in the case of Sisenna.

3.15. Post-Sallustian writers

At first sight the prose styles of Sallust and Livy are completely different—the former abbreviated and dense, the latter smoothly flowing. In vocabulary, however, both continued (as, later, did Tacitus) in the tradition that had become established, using archaisms and poeticisms, though Livy did so to a lesser extent as his work progressed.[137] One would not be surprised to find contemporaries or successors doing likewise; as far as the structure of their prose is concerned, they could not but react, one way or the other, to the way Sallust and Livy had written. The amount of evidence, however, is very limited, a situation partly due to the fact that Nonius cites no historian later than Fenestella (and, indeed, very few authors in any genre who wrote between the reigns of Tiberius and Hadrian[138]). In what follows we can do little more than indicate the evidence that exists. Historical style in the period is,

[131] See, however, J. Aumont, *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine* (Paris, 1996), 143–57.

[132] Cf. H. Aili, *The Prose Rhythm of Sallust and Livy* (Stockholm, 1979).

[133] Rome, 1968.

[134] As Oakley observes, in 6 F35 three double trochees and two hexameter endings are accompanied by series of five and ten long syllables.

[135] *Antike Kunstprosa*[2], 1. 178–9.

[136] To take the fragments of book 1, omitting F6, F1 *uerba Gallis dedit* (double cretic), 4 *euertendam habere* (double trochee), 10 *magnam consumpserat* (molossus+cretic),14 *in uiam pronoluerunt* (cretic+double trochee), F21 *ingenti copiantur* (molossus+double trochee), F23 *medium reliquemus* (cretic+trochee), F33 *putaretur uictoria esse* (molossus+double trochee). Badian ('Early historians', 35 n. 100) thought that the word order at F59 *cederent hosti* (cretic+trochee) and 84 *igneam incenderet* (double cretic) was determined by the rhythm. He added F83, not realizing that *funditore* lacks authority; without it, *defendebant facillime* produces a hypodochmiac. But in all three cases considerations of emphasis may have been predominant. See further Zimmerer, *Quadrigarius*, 117–19.

[137] Cf. Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 12–17, Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 142–8.

[138] Cf. H. D. Jocelyn in A. Isola, E. Menestò, and A. Di Pilla (eds.), *Curiositas: studi di cultura classica e medievale in onore di Ubaldo Pizzani* (Naples, 2002), 9.

of course, best studied in the extant works of Cornelius Nepos, Velleius Paterculus, and Tacitus.

Q. Aelius Tubero

Matters of linguistic or stylistic interest occur in 38 F6, 7, and 12–14; see commentary ad locc.

Oppius

The two verbatim citations (40 F3–4), from the same passage of Charisius, are both examples of his use of *uulgu* (rather than *uulgo*) as the ablative singular of *uulgus*.

Cornelius Nepos

45 F11, 14, and 15 are cited, respectively, for *architectari* used passively, the hapax *largitudo*, and *culmum* neuter.

Varro

There is no reason to think that the style of Varro in his historical works (only 52 F1 and F4 preserve verbatim citations) differed much from that of his extant prose writings, which exhibit a tendency to archaism.[139]

Asinius Pollio

See I. 442–3 and comm. on F7, 9–11, 13.

Arruntius

The fragments are cited by Seneca to demonstrate the author's excessive imitation of Sallust.

Augustus

60 F15 *pertaesus morum peruersitatem eius* may not be a verbatim citation, but if it is, the alliterative repetition of *per-* is presumably deliberate.[140]

M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus

61 F6 is the famous description of Dellius as *desultor bellorum ciuilium*. It is impossible to say whether Messalla coined the phrase before or after Ovid wrote *desultor amoris* (*am.* 1.3.15).

Clodius Licinus

64 F3–4 are cited for matters of accidence and lexicology respectively.

Fenestella

See I. 495.

[139] Cf. Adams, *PBA* 129 (2005), 78.

[140] We omit F24P; see I. 456 and commentary on Sisenna 26 F113.

Cremutius Cordus, Bruttedius Niger, Aufidius Bassus

On the descriptions of Cicero's death and obituaries, cited by the elder Seneca, see commentary on 71 F1, 72 F1, and 78 F12. They are of interest for their periodic structure, but, unlike Livy's (fr. 59–60 Jal; cf. Tränkle, *WS* 81 (1968), 142–9), contain no unusual features of vocabulary or word order. They exhibit a number of Ciceronian clausulae, but not consistently so.

Trajan[141]

96 F1 is cited by Priscian for a ('barbarian') place-name in *-i*.

4. THE CITING AUTHORITIES

4.1. Overview

This collection contains 1,203 fragments, of which 536 purport to be verbatim and 452 have attributed book numbers. Many of these fragments are cited more than once in our sources, so the total number of citations is substantially higher. Overall our sources provide 1,368 citations of the fragmentary Roman historians, of which 606 purport to be verbatim, and 495 purport to give the number of the book in which the cited passage occurred.[1]

These citations are found in ninety-nine extant sources. However, most of these sources preserve only a small number of citations, with thirty-five preserving only a single citation. Table 1 gives the citation distribution for the twenty most frequently citing sources, ranked by their number of citations. These twenty sources' citations constitute 84 per cent of the total citations, 89 per cent of the verbatim citations, and 96 per cent of the citations with attributed book number.

The citing sources are very diverse. Chronologically, they range from Polybius, the earliest source, to the Byzantine period. Their works vary widely in aims and character, and as a result there are marked differences in their citation of the fragmentary writers.

The historians Livy, Dionysius, and Tacitus and the biographers Suetonius and Plutarch cite our authors solely in relation to matters of historical fact, for example to comment on their accuracy or note divergences between their authorities, and never cite them verbatim or with book numbers. Other extant historical writers cite the

[141] If *iuuenescere* in Seneca (the elder) 74 F2 was used by Seneca himself, he was employing a word found previously only in Augustan poetry; but the citation is by Lactantius and the verb is common in Christian writers. See *TLL* 7.2.731–2.

[1] Certain fragments whose attribution is uncertain appear under two authors in our collection, but are counted only once in the calculations in this section and the associated tables: the fragments not included for this reason are Fabius Servilianus 8 F5–11, Cn. Gellius 14 F37–8, Quadrigarius 24 F99, Antias 25 F71, Macer 27 F32. Macer 27 F19, which does not name Macer, is also excluded. The calculations include fragments which we have classed as doubtful, except for *Annales Maximi* F7–12, which some scholars have taken as citations of the pontifical record but in our view probably do not relate to it (see commentary) and are accordingly omitted here to avoid distortion.

Table 1. Most frequently citing sources

	all citations	verbatim citations	citations with book numbers	authors cited
Nonius Marcellus	215	215	195	11
Aulus Gellius	131	103	97	21
Servius and Servius Danielis	91	20	10	21
Livy	86			12
Pliny, *Natural History*	83	4	8	24
Plutarch	79	2		29
Priscian	79	79	58	18
Charisius	61	61	37	17
Cicero	45	1		13
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	42			11
Historia Augusta	39	5		7
Macrobius, *Saturnalia*	35	11	17	18
Origo Gentis Romanae	34		16	19
Suetonius	32	1		22
Stephanus Byzantinus	27	12	18	1
Tacitus	18			11
Festus and Paulus Festus	17	16	12	4
Asconius	14		2	8
Solinus	12			9
Diomedes	11	11	6	6
Other sources	217	65	19	
Total citations	*1368*	*606*	*495*	

fragmentary Roman historians less frequently, but, when they do, they follow the same practice.[2] Much the same is true of Cicero: his interest in these historians mainly related to their subject matter, and he held their style in low esteem (GT1–2); he gives few verbatim citations and none with book number.

By contrast, the lexicographers Festus and Nonius Marcellus, the grammarians Charisius, Diomedes, and Priscian, and other less frequently citing grammarians (who preserve fourteen citations between them) cite passages from the fragmentary writers simply for linguistic purposes, to illustrate the meaning or formation of individual words. Apart from one instance in Festus (150=Alfius 69 F1), all their citations are verbatim, and a high proportion are by book number. This gives their evidence great importance both for the language and style of the lost works and

[2] The only verbatim citations of the fragmentary historians in extant historical or biographical writers are the *Historia Augusta*'s three references to Marius Maximus' use of the word *tetrafarmacum* (Marius Maximus 101 F8), its reference to his use of the term *seditiosi* (F14), and its quotation of the senate's acclamations at the death of Commodus from the same writer (F16). Suetonius includes a verbatim citation of Pollio (56 F3a) at *Iul.* 30.4 only because Pollio purported to be quoting Caesar's actual words. Appian purports to give a translation into Greek of the exchange between L. Antonius and Octavian as recorded in the latter's memoirs (Augustus 60 F8).

for their book structure. However, these citations are usually very brief, and for a high proportion the context in the lost works cannot be determined.[3]

Other sources fall between these extremes. Some, including Aulus Gellius, Servius, and Macrobius, have interests ranging across history, institutions, and language, and cite the fragmentary historians for all these purposes. Both these writers and others like the elder Pliny whose interests relate primarily to content sometimes cite the fragmentary historians verbatim and/or display their scholarship by including a book number in their citation.

Exceptional value for our purposes is provided by the prolific citations of Aulus Gellius: most of his citations are verbatim and/or include book numbers; he gives verbatim citations not just to illustrate matters of language and style, but also in a good many cases where his concern is with content; and some of his verbatim extracts are lengthy. Another notable, though problematic, source is the brief treatise known as the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, which includes a remarkably dense range of citations within its small compass, including several authors not attested elsewhere; none of its citations is verbatim, but nearly half give book numbers.

There is considerable variation also in the number of historians cited by the individual citing authorities. Thus, among historical and biographical writers, both Plutarch and Suetonius draw on a very wide range of works relevant to the periods they were writing about, many of which were evidently little known. Livy, on the other hand, although copious with his citations, takes them from a quite restricted range of sources, which on the early period omits several authors cited by Dionysius.[4] Among those writers with exclusively linguistic interests, Charisius and Priscian cite a wider number of the fragmentary historians than Nonius, whose exceptionally heavy use of Sisenna's third and fourth books accounts for 120 of his 215 citations from our authors. Twenty-four of the *Historia Augusta*'s citations of the fragmentary historians are taken from its predecessor in imperial biography, Marius Maximus, while Stephanus of Byzantium figures in our collection solely for his citations of Asinius Quadratus.

The sources' citations are taken from ninety-four lost Roman historical authors (and from the *Annales Maximi*). The remaining sixteen historians in our collection are known from testimonia alone.[5] Many of the cited authors receive only a small number of citations, and twenty-three are cited only once. Table 2 gives data for the twenty-one most frequently cited authors, whose citations comprise 79 per cent of the overall total. The authors are ranked by their number of citations, and for each author

[3] For a discussion of the grammarians and lexicographers as sources for the fragmentary historians see M. Chassignet in G. Abbamonte, E. C. Bizzarro, L. Spina (eds.), *L'ultima parola: l'analisi dei testi: teorie e pratiche nell'antichità greca e latina* (Naples, 2004), 55–74.

[4] Eight writers are cited by both Livy and Dionysius. Cassius Hemina, Vennonius, and Tuditanus are cited by Dionysius, but not by Livy. Of the three writers cited by Livy, but not by Dionysius, Coelius Antipater certainly and Rutilius Rufus probably did not cover the period with which Dionysius dealt, and Dionysius' work survives only in fragmentary form for the period in which Claudius Quadrigarius' history began.

[5] The following Roman historical writers are known by testimonia alone: P. Cornelius Scipio (3), Lucullus (23), Otacilius Pitholaus (29), Hortensius (31), Licinius Apollonius (35), Octavius Ruso (48), Furnius (50), Claudius Sideropogon (76), Arulenus Rusticus (88), Herennius Senecio (89), Vibius Maximus (90), Claudius Pollio (91), Pompeius Saturninus (92), C. Fannius (93), Titinius Capito (95), Juventius Martialis (106).

Table 2. Most frequently cited authors

	all			verbatim			% verbatim
	citations	fragments	citers	citations	fragments	citers	citation
Cato, *Origines* (5)	207	156	42	117	91	19	56.5
Sisenna (26)	159	145	15	151	139	12	95.0
Claudius Quadrigarius (24)	109	98	10	87	78	7	79.8
Coelius Antipater (15)	75	68	18	47	43	12	62.7
Valerius Antias (25)	75	70	14	9	9	3	12.0
Piso (9)	49	48	16	6	6	3	12.2
Cassius Hemina (6)	49	43	15	28	26	5	57.1
Fabius Pictor (1)	43	32	22	4	3	4	9.3
Cn. Gellius (14)	40	36	14	16	13	4	40.0
Fenestella (70)	37	33	18	8	8	5	21.6
Licinius Macer (27)	34	31	11	11	8	3	32.4
Asinius Quadratus (102)	33	31	6	13	11	2	39.4
Sulla (22)	28	27	6	3	3	2	10.7
Marius Maximus (101)	25	21	2	5	3	1	20.0
Augustus (60)	21	19	8	1	1	1	4.8
Tubero (38)	19	18	11	7	7	5	36.8
Cornelius Nepos (45)	19	15	10	3	3	3	15.8
Asinius Pollio (56)	18	13	11	9	7	6	50.0
Rutilius Rufus (21)	17	17	9	9	9	3	52.9
Sempronius Asellio (20)	15	15	6	13	13	5	86.7
Hyginus (63)	15	15	4	0			0.0
Other authors	281	252		59	55		21.0
Total citations/fragments	1368	1203		606	536		44.3

the table shows the totals for all citations and for verbatim citations, the number of citing sources in each category, and the percentage of citations purporting to be verbatim. A good many of these authors' fragments are cited more than once, and the fragment totals are accordingly shown in separate columns next to the citation totals.

Table 3 analyses the distribution of citations across the fragmentary authors for seventeen of the most frequently citing sources, listed by likely date of composition.[6] Table 4 analyses the distribution of verbatim citations for those authors and citing sources for which such citations are preserved.

As these tables show, the most-cited authors are for the most part historians who wrote in the period from the beginnings of Roman historiography down to the early first century BC (the time of Quadrigarius, Antias, Sisenna, and Macer) and whose works dealt with the history of Rome either for the whole or some part of that period.

[6] Three of the sources included in Table 1 are omitted from Table 3, namely Tacitus, the *Historia Augusta*, and Stephanus of Byzantium. For the last two writers' restricted citation see above. Tacitus cites Sulla, Sisenna, and Tiro once each, but otherwise cites exclusively from early imperial authors.

Table 3. Citation distribution in frequently citing sources

	Cic.	Livy	DH	Ascon.	Pliny	Plut.	Suet.	Gell.	Fest. & Paul. Fest.	Solinus	*OGR*	Non.	Charis.	Diomed.	Serv.	Macr. *Sat.*	Prisc.	Other sources	Total
Fabius (1)	2	6	8		2	2		1		1	1	1			3			16	43
Cincius (2)		1	4							1	2				1			5	14
Postumius (4)						2		1			1				1	2		1	8
Cato (5)	13	1	6		10	3		29	12	1	2	12	15		38	4	26	35	207
Hemina (6)					4			1		2	1	16		1	6	4	7	7	49
Acilius (7)	1	2	1			1					1							2	8
Piso (9)	1	6	6		14	1		3			3				2	2	2	9	40
Tuditanus (10)			2	1	1	1		2			1					2			10
Fannius (12)	4					1							1				2	1	9
Cn. Gellius (14)	1		6		5			2		2	1		12		3	3	1	4	40
Coelius (15)	8	11		1	3			2	2			12	7		7	1	14	7	75
Scaurus (18)													1	3	1			2	7
Asellio (20)								8				2	2		1		1	1	15
Rutilius (21)		1				2		1					6	2		1		4	17
Sulla (22)	1				1	22		2									1	1	28
Quadrigarius (24)		12						46				31		2	3	3	6	6	109
Antias (25)		35	1	2	6	4		9			2		2			2	2	10	75
Sisenna (26)	4							6	2			129	3		3	2	3	7	159
Macer (27)		8	6		2					1	2	5		1		2	5	2	34
Tubero (38)		3	1		1		2	4			1	2	1		2			2	19
Oppius (40)					1	2	1	2					2						8
Nepos (45)					3			5		2			1				1	7	19
Varro (52)								1					3		3	1			8
Pollio (56)						3	3						2			1	3	6	18
Augustus (60)					2	6	4								2			7	21
Hyginus (63)				1				3							9	2			15
Fenestella (70)				5	8	3	1	1				3		2		1	1	12	37
Other authors	10		1	4	20	29	21	2	1	2	16	2	3		5	2	4	145	267
Total	45	86	42	14	83	82	32	131	17	12	34	215	61	11	90	35	79	299	1368

Table 4. Distribution of verbatim citations in frequently citing sources

	Cic.	Pliny	Suet.	Gell.	Fest. & Paul. Fest.	Non.	Charis.	Diomed.	Serv.	Macr. *Sat.*	Prisc.	Other sources	Total
Fabius (1)				1		1			1			1	4
Cincius (2)												2	2
Postumius (4)				1						2			3
Cato (5)				29	12	12	15		6	2	26	15	117
Hemina (6)		2				16		1	2		7		28
Piso (9)				3							2	1	6
Fannius (12)							1				2	1	4
Cn. Gellius (14)				2			12				1	1	16
Coelius (15)	1			2	2	12	7		4	1	14	4	47
Scaurus (18)							1	3	1				5
Asellio (20)				7		2	2		1		1		13
Rutilius (21)							6	2				1	9
Sulla (22)				2							1		3
Quadrigarius (24)				43		31		2	2	2	6	1	87
Antias (25)				5			2				2		9
Sisenna (26)				6	2	129	3		1	2	3	5	151
Macer (27)						5		1			5		11
Tubero (38)				2		2	1		1			1	7
Oppius (40)							2						2
Nepos (45)							1				1	1	3
Varro (52)							3						3
Pollio (56)			1				2			1	3	2	9
Augustus (60)		1											1
Fenestella (70)						3		2		1	1	1	8
Other authors		1				2	3		1		4	47	58
Total	1	4	1	103	16	215	61	11	20	11	79	84	606

These historians were widely cited as evidence for history and institutions, and their style also led to their being extensively exploited for illustrative material by writers concerned with the meaning and formation of words.

Cato was much the most substantial literary figure among the writers included in our collection. His *Origines*, itself only a part of his literary legacy, is by some way the most cited of all the histories in the collection, and is cited by almost twice as many sources as the nearest rival. It should, however, be noted that even this record is easily surpassed by that of Sallust's *Histories*, not included in this collection.

Among the other early historians, only Coelius Antipater attracted a comparably broad range of interest, being cited extensively as historical evidence by Cicero, Livy, and some later writers, and for linguistic purposes by Nonius, Charisius, and Priscian. Some others among these historians received much attention from one or two writers and rather less elsewhere. The extreme case is Sisenna, for whom Nonius' numerous citations make up 81 per cent of the total. Quadrigarius too was cited a good deal by Nonius, and his style had a special appeal for Gellius, who, besides frequent citations elsewhere, devoted a whole chapter (17.2) to extracts from his first book: these two authors account for 71 per cent of Quadrigarius' citations. By contrast, Antias, who in the opinion of Gellius' friend Fronto wrote 'charmlessly' (GT6: *inuenuste*), was little cited for language, but much as a historical source. Of the chief annalists of the later second century BC, Piso is cited a good deal as a historical source, but little for language; Cn. Gellius, although ignored by Livy, is cited quite widely for both purposes, and for language particularly by Charisius; and Cassius Hemina is not cited at all until Pliny, but receives a fair amount of citation from late antique scholars apart from Charisius.

Among historians writing after the early first century BC, only Tubero and Fenestella, both following the traditional model of annalistic history from the foundation, achieve a fair range of citation both as historical sources and for language. The historians who wrote just on the late republican or early imperial periods were little cited for language, and our knowledge of them derives mainly from extant authors dealing with those periods, especially the elder Pliny, Tacitus, Plutarch, and Suetonius.

There are no verbatim citations of the historians writing in Greek. What purport to be verbatim citations of these writers either refer to Latin versions of their histories (so probably Fabius Pictor 1 F4d–e, 29, 31 and Postumius Albinus 4 F2) or are merely translations from the Greek by the citing author or an intermediary (so Postumius Albinus 4 F1b, and perhaps Cincius Alimentus 2 F9). (See further the commentaries on those fragments and the introductions to Fabius Pictor and Postumius Albinus). Particularly valuable information on the historical tradition is provided by multiple citations, where authors cite two or more historians' accounts of the same event. Only rarely do such citations include verbatim material, but two notable instances are Pliny's account of the episode of Numa's books (*nat.* 13.84–8), with an extensive verbatim citation from Cassius Hemina (6 F35), and the elder Seneca's discussion of various writers' treatments of the death of Cicero, with verbatim extracts from Livy and four of the lost historians (*suas.* 6.14–27).

Allowance must always be made for the possibility of mis-citation. Statements claiming to paraphrase a lost historian may misrepresent his meaning, and

purportedly verbatim citations may have been quoted inaccurately or corrupted in transmission. Cited book numbers, like other numerals, have a high risk of corruption in scribal transmission, and several instances can be identified in which the reported book number must be erroneous.[7]

Some writers may have fabricated at least some of their attributions to earlier historians. The *Historia Augusta* cites a large number of fictitious historians (see I. 78, 650–1), and some of its citations of authentic sources provoke doubts. Similar issues arise for the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, Fulgentius, and Cynthius Cenetensis (see further the discussions of some of these writers in the next section).

Contrary to what was often claimed in the heyday of *Quellenforschung*, extant historians' and biographers' citations from their predecessors were probably often at first hand. However, the citations from the fragmentary historians in the extant grammarians and lexicographers, and in other late antique works such as Servius' commentary, Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, and the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, were for the most part probably drawn indirectly from earlier scholars, with the conspicuous exception of Nonius' exploitation of Sisenna's third and fourth books as one of his direct sources of quotations. (See further the discussions of the individual citing sources in the next section.)

For full references to individual sources' citations of the fragmentary historians see the Index to sources of fragments (III. 683–94).

4.2. Individual sources

This section provides brief entries on the individual writers citing fragments of the historians in our collection, except for writers who cite only a single fragment, on whom information is usually provided in the commentary on the fragment in question rather than in this section. The writers' use of the fragmentary historians is discussed, and other information is included as appropriate to assist readers of the present work.

The editions of these writers' works which we have used in citing the fragments and testimonia are listed at I. xl–xlix.

Appian

Appian of Alexandria was born about the end of the first century AD. At some point he acquired Roman citizenship, and after achieving some distinction in Alexandria moved to Rome as an advocate, and, with the support of his friend Fronto, was appointed a procurator by Antoninus Pius.

Appian wrote a history of the Romans' wars in Greek in twenty-four books, of which ten survive intact and six in excerpts. Eschewing conventional annalistic organization, Appian adopted a primarily geographical arrangement: the first twelve books narrated the external wars of the republic by the regions in which they

[7] Discrepancies over book numbers occur for the following multiple citations: Cato 5 F18, 35, 36; Cn. Gellius 14 F9; Quadrigarius 24 F20; Sisenna 26 F129, 130; Asinius Quadratus 102 F15. Pliny (*nat.* 13.87) must be wrong to attribute Antias 25 F58 to his third book (see commentary on the fragment).

occurred, with each book being introduced at the point at which the Romans first went to war with the peoples of the region with which it deals. These were followed by five books on the civil wars down to 36 BC (all extant). The work was completed by four books on the Romans' dealings with Egypt and three on the emperors' wars, but these books are completely lost. Appian's account of the Illyrian wars, which survives complete, was appended to the book on the Macedonian wars.

Appian's sources have been much discussed, with little agreement. It is clear that he used a limited range of sources, and shaped what he took from them with considerable freedom. For the period down to 264 BC his material derives mostly from Dionysius, and for the period 200–146 BC it is drawn mostly from Polybius. Many scholars suppose that he used these sources through an intermediary, but it is more likely that he consulted them directly himself. For the periods 264–201 and after 146 BC he worked mostly from writers who survive for us only in fragments and are correspondingly more difficult to identify.

Appian cites named sources eleven times in the surviving parts of his work. Two of these references are to respectively Polybius (*Pun.* 132.628–31) and Hieronymus of Cardia (*Mithr.* 8.25); two more are to Caesar (*BGall.* 18.3, *BCiv.* 2.79.329). The remaining seven are to authors in our collection. Not all these citations will be based on direct consultation. The references to Paulus Clodius at *Gall.* 1.8 (=Paulus Clodius 16 F2) and to 'Causius the Roman', probably to be identified with Cassius Hemina, at *Gall.* 6.3 (=Cassius Hemina 6 F22) are likely to have been taken over by Appian from his source. Pollio has often been thought to have been a main source for much of Appian's account of the civil-war period, but this is not certain, and the fact that his citation of Pollio for Pompeian casualties at Pharsalus (*b.c.* 2.82.346= Pollio 56 F4c) is shared with Plutarch may suggest that Appian took it either from Plutarch himself or from a common intermediary (see further I. 393, 439–40, 470–1). The apparent citation of Libo at *b.c.* 3.77.314 (=Libo 36 F2) is problematic, and should possibly be emended to Livy (see comm. ad loc.). Appian will, however, have used Augustus' memoirs directly at least for his account of the Illyrian wars, for which it was evidently the principal source (citation at *Ill.* 14.42=Augustus 60 F9), and perhaps also on the civil wars (citations at *b.c.* 4.110.463 and perhaps at 5.45.191= Augustus 60 F7c, 8).

Appian mentions Fabius Pictor at *Hann.* 27.116 (=Fabius 1 T3c) and Rutilius Rufus at *Hisp.* 88.382 (=Rutilius 21 T4), in each case describing them as 'the historian', but these references merely relate to an event in each individual's career and do not necessarily (as has sometimes been supposed) imply the use of their work as a source.

Viereck and Roos included in their edition of Appian a division of each of the extant books into numbered paragraphs, in addition to the traditional division into numbered chapters. For convenience we generally give both references in our citations.

A Budé edition of Appian is in progress, and other commentaries have been published on several of Appian's books. Other studies include B. Goldmann, *Einheitlichkeit und Eigenständigkeit der Historia Romana des Appian* (Hildesheim, 1988); A. M. Gowing, *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1992); and the essays collected in *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), and in a

forthcoming volume edited by K. Welch (with contribution on the source question by J. W. Rich).

(JWR)

Arnobius

The Christian apologist Arnobius (no other names are recorded) is known as the author of *Aduersus nationes*, a work in seven books. According to Jerome (*uir. ill.* 79), he taught rhetoric at Sicca in Africa during the reign of Diocletian. Jerome further informs us (*uir. ill.* 80) that Lactantius was his pupil. The first part of *adu. nat.* dates from shortly before AD 297 (at 2.71 he states that the city of Rome is 1,050 years old or a little less), but later passages seem to have been written during Diocletian's persecution, which began in 303.[8] The work sets out not so much to defend Christianity as to attack paganism, from which Arnobius had been recently converted. It provides a mine of information about pagan cults (books 3–5), myths (book 5), shrines and images (book 6), and ritual practices (book 7). In the course of this he cites no fewer than fifty-one Greek authors and more than twenty Latin ones. He also includes a great number of anonymous references to *auctores*, *scriptores* (variously qualified), and more specifically to philosophers and sages, historians, poets, and theologians, frequently qualified as *nostri* (i.e. Christian) or *uestri* (i.e. pagan).[9]

A great deal of the material in Arnobius is likely to be tralaticious. Many of its arguments, and some of its references, were probably taken from earlier Christian apologists, including Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Minucius Felix, and Tertullian. The many parallel passages between these authors and Arnobius suggest very strongly that he knew and used them, even if direct dependence can never be proved conclusively and in spite of the fact that he never acknowledges any of them by name. Much of his information may also have been taken from the pagan authors he was answering, notably the neoplatonists Porphyry and Cornelius Labeo. It is therefore hard to know whether Arnobius had first-hand knowledge of any of the classical authors he cites, and if so which ones. A case can be made for the Roman poets Ennius, Lucretius, and Virgil, and for Cicero (especially the *De natura deorum*) and Varro among the prose writers. Varro is cited more than any other Latin author (see Le Bonniec, 48) and was probably a major source for Arnobius (although even in his case we cannot rule out the possibility of intermediaries).

Two of the passages that preserve historical fragments deal with controversial issues and cite the arguments of several named authors. At 3.38–9, in a discussion of the *di nouensiles*, Arnobius names seven authors: Piso, Granius (Flaccus?), Aelius (Stilo), Cornificius, Cincius, Manilius, and Varro, and at 6.7 four authors: Sammonicus, Granius, Valerius Antias, and Fabius, in connection with the story of a

[8] See the careful analysis of M. B. Simmons, *Arnobius of Sicca* (Oxford, 1995), 47–93, proving that the work cannot be later than the end of the Great Persecution. His interpretation of 2.71 (60–2), however, is clearly wrong, as is that of M. J. Edwards, *AntTard* 12 (2004), 270. We are inclined to agree with Le Bonniec (see next note), 34, that the composition of the work took place over several years between 296 and 311.

[9] A complete list is given in a useful note in the Budé edition of H. Le Bonniec, *Arnobe: contre les gentils* 1 (Paris, 1982), 35 n. 1.

human head discovered on the Capitoline. In both cases these clusters of references are likely to have been taken at second or third hand from intermediaries, and the identities of the authors in question are uncertain to us, and were probably equally so to Arnobius. Piso in the first list is probably the annalist of that name (Piso 9 F43), but Cincius is unlikely to be the historian Cincius Alimentus (Cincius 2 F8 with comm.). In the second list the name Valerius Antias is the result of an emendation (see Antias 25 F69 and comm.), and Fabius may be identical with Fabius Pictor (1 F30) or with Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8 F9), or with neither (see comm. ad locc.). Finally Valerius Antias is cited, whether directly or through Varro or another intermediary, at 5.1 (Valerius Antias 25 F8) for the story of how Numa tricked Jupiter out of a human sacrifice. This fragment is the only example in Arnobius of a historical extract cited with a book number.

On the text, preserved in two manuscripts, see H. Le Bonniec (ed.), *Arnobe: contre les gentils* 1 (Paris, 1982), 96–100. This volume has a useful general introduction and notes, as does the English translation of G. E. McCracken, *Arnobius of Sicca: The Case against the Pagans* (New York, 1949). In general see P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne* 3 (Paris, 1905), 241–86; M. B. Simmonds, *Arnobius of Sicca* (Oxford, 1995).

(TJC)

Asconius

Q. Asconius Pedianus was probably born in the north Italian city of Patavium: *Livius noster* (77C) seems a good indication of compatriotism. Jerome (*chron.* 188[e]) reports under the year AD 76 that Asconius went blind in his eighty-fifth year and lived on for another twelve years. Jerome's source for this information will have been Suetonius' *De uiris illustribus*, which therefore probably gave AD 76 as the date of Asconius' death. Asconius seems to have moved in high society as early as the reign of Tiberius: the *Suda* (s.v. 'Apicius') tells us that he accompanied Junius Blaesus to a dinner given by Apicius, when Blaesus was consul in AD 28, and Servius (*ad Ecl.* 4.11) reports a conversation between Asconius and Asinius Gallus in which Gallus claimed to be the marvellous child foretold in the fourth *Eclogue*. Asconius' familiarity with senatorial procedure suggests he may have been a senator himself; if not he was certainly an *eques*.

Asconius appears to have written on a wide range of topics, but most of the attested work can be classed as literary criticism, literary biography (of Sallust), or commentary (see I. Appendix 1, A7, for our reasons for not including him as a historian in this edition); his tastes reflect the classicizing revival of the Neronian and Flavian periods. Commentaries (*enarrationes*) on five speeches of Cicero survive, which can be dated with reasonable confidence between AD 54 and 57; that these were not the only five on which he wrote can be reliably inferred from passing references in other writers, and with less certainty from internal evidence. The Commentaries were ostensibly addressed to his two sons in order to prepare them for a senatorial career (e.g. 43C). He is cited by Quintilian (*inst.* 1.7.24, 5.10.9) and the elder Pliny (*nat.* 7.159). He clearly read widely and researched carefully; he seeks to explain the what, where, and how of the speeches, identifying persons, interpreting allusions to events, setting out the historical context, and explaining technical points, especially in terms

of legal and constitutional practice rather than literary technique (this, presumably, his sons, or any educated reader, could have got elsewhere with no difficulty). His detailed knowledge of the history of the Ciceronian age is extremely impressive and mostly accurate. Asconius is not above being wrong, or getting hold of the wrong end of the stick, and some of his glosses are clearly guesswork; but his guesses are informed, and his errors are not silly. In other words, he knew by and large what he was doing, and how to evaluate evidence and present his explanations clearly. That he was exacting in the levels of accuracy he expected from others is clear from his picking upon Fenestella's miscalculation of the date of the *Pro Roscio Amerino* (Gellius 15.28.4; see Fenestella 70 F18 with comm.).

Asconius drew on a wide range of historical sources, including official documents and literary accounts. For the most part, however, he simply gives the necessary historical information, without acknowledging his source(s), even anonymously, although he refers generally to *annales* (i.e. works of history) at 30C and to historians of the Second Punic War at 3C (=Coelius 15 F63). As in the latter instance, he refers to particular sources when correcting what he takes to be errors in Cicero (see 13C: Antias 25 F21; Atticus 33 F7; Hyginus 63 F1; Varro *De vita p.R.* 96 Riposati; 66–7C: Fenestella 70 F20, also Sallust and Livy), but also occasionally to support or defend the historical validity of Cicero's statements (e.g. 77C: Tuditanus 10 F8; Atticus 33 F3). He also names sources whose interpretations he wants to challenge (85–6C: Fenestella 70 F21a–b), or when reporting matters of dispute (31C: Fenestella 70 F23). Fenestella is the most frequently cited historian (five times, but three times in disagreement); Valerius Antias and Atticus are each cited twice. The most frequently cited source of all, however, is the senatorial record known as the *acta diurna*, instituted by Caesar in 59 BC. Asconius clearly drew extensively upon the *acta*, whose influence can be detected in many places beyond the six passages where they are explicitly acknowledged. In two of these passages he quotes directly from speeches recorded in the *acta* (44–5C and 48C). These are the only verbatim quotations in Asconius, apart from a line of the poet Licinius Calvus at 93C; in his citations of literary historians he reports what they say indirectly. Of the historians, Asconius refers to Antias, Fenestella, and Tuditanus by name only, as with Sallust and Livy; he also refers once simply to Pomponius Atticus (77C=Atticus 33 F3), but elsewhere to Atticus' *annalis* (13C=Atticus 33 F7). He gives the title and book number only in the cases of Hyginus, *De uiris illustribus* book 1 (13C=Hyginus 63 F1) and Tiro, *De uita Ciceronis* book 4 (41C=Tiro 46 F1), but also of Varro *de uita p.R.* book 3 (13C).

On the text see M. D. Reeve, *Texts and Transmission*, 24–5. Commentaries on Asconius include B. A. Marshall, *A Historical Commentary on Asconius* (Columbia, Ohio, 1985); and R. G. Lewis, *Asconius: Commentaries on Speeches by Cicero* (Oxford, 2006), the latter with Clark's text (and pagination) and English translation.

(EHB/TJC)

Bede

Among the voluminous output of the Venerable Bede (AD 673–735) is a work *de orthographia* (*GL* 7.261–94), which, in a single passage, cites, verbatim and with book number, Cato 5 F43 and 44. Charisius cites the fragments in identical language and, as with other quotations of classical authors in the work, Bede has clearly taken them

from Charisius (for Bede's knowledge of classical writers cf. L. D. Reynolds, N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*[3] (Oxford, 1991), 88–9).

See Keil, *GL* 7. 222–6.

(JB)

Cassius Dio

L. Cassius Dio (*c.* AD 164–after 229) came from a prominent family in Nicaea in Bithynia. He followed his father into the senate and held various positions culminating in the proconsulship of Africa and legateships of Dalmatia and Upper Pannonia (*c.*223–8) and the ordinary consulship of 229, held with the emperor, Severus Alexander, as colleague. Dio tells us (72.23) that he embarked on his *Roman History* after producing shorter works (lost to us) on the portents presaging the accession of Septimius Severus and on the wars following the death of Commodus, and that for the history he spent ten years collecting the material for events up to the death of Severus (211) and a further twelve years writing them up. The dates of composition of the history are disputed, but the most natural interpretation of Dio's words is that he began work *c.*202. He concluded the work with his own retirement in 229.

The *Roman History* is extant for the period 69 BC to AD 46 (36.1.1–60.28.1), with substantial lacunae after 6 BC. For the rest we depend on excerpts and the epitomes of Zonaras and Xiphilinus. Like its author, the work is an amalgam of Greek and Roman elements. It is written in Attic Greek, and borrows extensively from the classical authors, especially Thucydides. However, in its structure it adopts the traditional Roman pattern of an annalistic history of civil and military affairs arranged by the consular year and extending from the foundation to the writer's own day.

For his own times Dio could draw on his own experience or oral evidence, but for earlier periods he was almost entirely dependent on literary sources, chiefly earlier histories. Attempts to identify individual sources are usually futile. The only sources Dio names are the autobiographies of Augustus (44.35.3=Augustus 60 F12, an inaccurate citation) and Hadrian (69.11.2=Hadrian 97 F6, and probably also 66.17.1=Hadrian 97 F5). (The reference at 48.44.4 is probably not to Augustus' autobiography: see on Augustus 60 F19.)

Xiphilinus had no text of Dio for the reign of Antoninus Pius. He accordingly filled this gap from other sources, and cites Asinius Quadratus for the emperor's death (102 F5, cited by Boissevain at Dio 70.3).

The standard edition of Cassius Dio is by U. Boissevain (Berlin 1895–1931). A Budé edition is in progress, and other commentaries have been published on various parts of his history. A number of monographs have appeared on aspects of his work, but the most comprehensive treatment remains F. G. B. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964). Several essays on Dio are included in *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997).

(JWR)

Censorinus

Censorinus (his full name is unknown) is mentioned as a *grammaticus* by Cassiodorus (*inst.* 2.1.1) and Priscian (*GL* 2.13), and in particular as the author of a work *De accentibus* (Cassiod. *inst.* 2.5.9; Prisc. *GL* 3.27, 45–7); otherwise he is known

as the author of the extant work *De die natali* ('On the Birthday'), a brief treatise addressed to his patron, the otherwise unknown Q. Caerellius.[10] The work was composed to celebrate Caerellius' forty-ninth birthday (15.1), and is dated precisely to the summer of AD 238 (18.12; 21.6). The work as extant contains twenty-four chapters covering a range of topics linked with birthdays, starting with biological generation of animals and humans (1–8), moving on to a digression on music and Pythagorean theories (9–13), and then to different stages of life (14–15), before ending with a discussion of chronology and divisions of time (16–24). The text, based on a single eighth-century manuscript (C: Cologne, Dombibl. 166) from which all others derive, breaks off at 24.6 in the middle of a description of the parts of the day and night. The rest of the work is lost.

In the course of the work Censorinus refers to numerous Greek authors (mostly philosophers) and to a smaller number of Latin poets and prose writers, including historians and antiquarians. Most of these references are likely to have been taken at second hand from intermediaries, of whom the likeliest is Varro, who is also quoted more than any other source.[11] The most important part of the work, because it provides information not available elsewhere, is the passage (16–24) dealing with chronology; chapter 21, in which Censorinus calculates the date at the time of writing according to various different eras, is largely based on Varro, and is in fact our principal source for the Varronian era, which dates events *ab urbe condita* on 21 April 753 BC.[12] The fragments of Roman historians, which occur in chapters 17 (on the secular games) and 20 (on the early Roman calendar), may also be quoted at second hand, but this cannot be certain in all cases; and the citation of Fenestella at 20.2 (Fenestella 70 F5) shows that Censorinus did not take them all from Varro.

These chapters contain much post-Varronian material, including later consular dates and imperial celebrations of the secular games. It is sometimes suggested that this later material was taken from Suetonius, who is quoted at 20.2, together with Junius Gracchanus, Fulvius (Nobilior), and Varro, in support of the idea that the original Roman calendar contained ten months, against the view of Licinius Macer (27 F10) and Fenestella (70 F5) that it had twelve. Perhaps so, but our knowledge of Suetonius' *Prata* or *De anno Romano* is so slight that certainty is impossible; and in any case Suetonius cannot be the source for the rising of Sirius on 1 Thoth (20 July), AD 139 (21.10), or for the seventh celebration of the secular games by Septimius Severus in 204 (17.11). The most probable explanation of these items, and therefore of much else besides, is that the work of compilation was done by Censorinus himself, who, although admittedly a compiler, was nevertheless an intelligent one; he

[10] From the work itself we learn that Caerellius was a Roman knight of provincial origin, who had held municipal offices and priesthoods, and was renowned for his eloquence in the provinces and at Rome (15.4–6).

[11] Varro is cited thirteen times in all (2.2; 9.1; 14.2; 14.6; 17.6; 17.8; 17.11; 17.14; 17.15; 20.2; 21.1; 21.5; 22.10). Varro dealt with chronology in the third section of the *Antiquitates humanae*, but also separately in the *Annales*, on which see H. A. Sanders, *AJPh* 23 (1902), 28–45; and see I. 419–21. On Censorinus and Varro see also F. Franceschi, *Aevum* 28 (1954), 394–418; G. Rocca-Serra, *Censorinus, Le jour natal* (Paris, 1980), v–ix.

[12] See A. T. Grafton, N. M. Swerdlow, *CQ* 35 (1985), 454–65. They argue (460) that the fundamental synchronization of epochs in Censorinus 21 is taken from Varro.

understood what he was doing and had a sound grasp of the complex and technically very difficult material he was dealing with.[13]

Most of the citations of republican historians occur in the chapter (17) on the secular games, where two historians, Livy and Piso, are cited verbatim (17.9 and 13 respectively); the first of these cannot have been taken from Varro, and may have been quoted at first hand by Censorinus, as may the verse of Horace in the same section. The references to the *commentarii* of the *XVuiri sacris faciundis*, an Augustan compilation, must also have been taken either at first hand or from a post-Varronian intermediary. The main problem in understanding Censorinus' text in this chapter lies in its defective transmission, especially where numerals are concerned. In one lacunose section (17.10) the name of the historian who recorded the second celebration of the games (Valerius Antias?) has dropped out of the text, together with the consular date. On this see the commentary on Antias 25 F22; and for the other citations see commentaries on Cassius Hemina 6 F40, Piso 9 F38, and Antias 25 F22, 26, and 64; on the variant traditions regarding the Roman *saecula*, the celebrations of the games, and the *commentarii* of the *XVuiri* see also comm. on Claudius 75 F1.

A critical edition with Italian translation and detailed commentary has been produced by C. A. Rapisarda (Bologna, 1991), and a French translation with valuable introduction and notes by G. Rocca-Serra (Paris, 1980). There are also recent translations into English and German by (respectively) H. N. Parker, *Censorinus, The Birthday Book* (Chicago and London, 2007) and K. Brodersen, *Censorinus, Das Geburtstagbuch* (Darmstadt, 2011); these have some basic notes. On Censorinus see P. L. Schmidt in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 246–9, with full bibliography. On the text see R. H. Rouse, R. M. Thomson in *Texts and Transmission*, 48–50.

(TJC)

Charisius

Flavius Sosipater Charisius wrote an *ars grammatica* in five books, probably completed during or after the reign of Julian (AD 361–3).

The text of Charisius depends on a palimpsest written at Bobbio in the eighth century (Naples, bibliotheca nazionale iv.A.8), now damaged (N), a copy of the manuscript made when it was still intact (n), and a now lost manuscript cited by the late fifteenth-century Dutch scholar J. Cuyck (C).

Charisius gives sixty-one citations (all verbatim) from seventeen of our authors, and of these thirty-seven carry a book number. Forty-seven citations occur in his discussion of noun-endings in 1.15 and 1.17 (61–187 Barwick), which includes a treatment of words listed alphabetically to illustrate 'analogy' (150–87). The remaining citations occur in the alphabetical part of his chapter on adverbs (2.13, 233–89 Barwick). As shown in Tables 3–4, Charisius cites a wide range of the early historians (but not Hemina, Quadrigarius, or Macer). He also cites several writers of the later first century BC, and once an author of the first century AD (Servilius Nonianus 79 F3). Charisius' twelve citations of Cn. Gellius are the highest number for this

[13] He is described by Grafton as a scholar 'more professional than Gellius and more technically adept than Macrobius' (*CR* 35 (1985), 48).

author in any source, but seven occur in a single passage (67–8), to illustrate the use of feminine plurals in *-abus* (for which see I. 26–7).

In his preface Charisius announces his work as treating 'the grammatical art polished by the skill of very learned men and arranged by me in five books' (*artem grammaticam sollertia doctissimorum uirorum politam et a me digestam in libris quinque*). As this suggests, his contribution may have been principally the compilation and arrangement of what he found in earlier grammarians, and most, perhaps all, of his citations may have been drawn from these predecessors. For his use of the commentary of Julius Paulus on the first book of Coelius Antipater see introduction to Coelius, I. 262.

See further Rouse, *Texts and Transmission*, 50–3; Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 392–4; Herzog–Schmidt 5. 125–31.

(JB/JWR)

Chronicon Paschale ('Easter Chronicle')

The *Chronicon Paschale* is a Greek chronicle composed in the early seventh century AD covering world history from the Creation to the author's own day. The work is particularly concerned to establish chronological connections between church feasts and the Creation and Incarnation, and each year is dated by different methods, but there are also substantial narrative sections.

The work made extensive use of Malalas with little rewriting for the mythological period and again from *c.* AD 400–532, and is thus one of the witnesses for the reconstruction of Malalas' text for these periods. The following fragments in our collection appear both in Malalas and in portions of the *Chronicon Paschale* deriving from him: Macer 27 F12, Pliny 80 F9; Bruttius 98 F1–2. See further below on Malalas.

The *Chronicon Paschale* is one of the many sources to cite Bruttius (98 F3f) for the Domitianic persecution, probably following Eusebius.

In general on the *Chronicon* see M. and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale* (Translated Texts for Historians 7, Liverpool, 1989). The standard edition by L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1832) still awaits replacement.

(JWR)

Cicero

On Cicero's life and works see the introduction to no. 39.

There are forty-four citations of the fragmentary Roman historians in Cicero's surviving works, relating to thirty-two separate fragments and drawn from thirteen writers. There is also one citation of the *Annales Maximi* (*rep.* 1.25=F5). (The reference to *annales populi Romani* at *dom.* 86 possibly relates to that record, but is more likely to refer to literary histories: see comm. on *Annales Maximi* F11.) Table 5 shows the distribution of Cicero's citations of our fragments by cited author and across Cicero's works, arranged in chronological order of composition. As the table shows, in most of his writing Cicero found only very occasional reason to cite the Roman historians, and, unsurprisingly, only Cato achieved quite frequent citation across Cicero's oeuvre, with eight fragments which certainly or possibly come from the *Origines* being cited thirteen times in all. The *De diuinatione*, with no fewer than sixteen citations of the historians, is a clear exception to the general pattern.

Table 5. Citation distribution in Cicero

	Verr.	*dom.*	*fam.* 5.12	*de orat.*	*Planc.*	*rep.*	*Brut.*	*orat.*	*acad.*	*Att.* 12.23, 13.30, 32	*Tusc.*	*nat. deor.*	*sen.*	*diu.*	*off.*	*fam.* 9.22	total
date (BC)	*70*	*57*	*55*	*55*	*54*	*c. 54*	*46*	*46*	*45*	*45*	*45*	*45*	*44*	*44*	*44*	*46 44*	
Annales Maximi		(1?)				1											1
Fabius (1)														2			2
Cato (5)	1			1	1	2	2				3 (2)		1	1	1		13 (8)
Acilius (7)															1		1
Piso (9)																1	1
C. Gracchus (11)														2 (1)			2 (1)
Fannius (12)				1			1		1		1						4 (2)
Cn. Gellius (14)														1			1
Coelius (15)				1 (v)				1				1		5			8 (7)
Sulla (22)														1			1
Sisenna (26)														4 (2)			4 (2)
Lucceius (30)			1														1
Atticus (33)							3			1							4
Libo (36)										2 (1)							2 (1)
total	1		1	3	1	3	6	1	1	3 (2)	4 (3)	1	1	16 (13)	2	1	45 (33)

Fragment totals are shown in brackets where differing from citation totals. (v) indicates a verbatim citation.

Cicero's citation practice reflects the character and requirements of his various works. Thus the historical examples in the speeches are for the most part well-known episodes that would have come from general knowledge rather than from identifiable sources, and it would generally have been inappropriate to acknowledge historical sources in the speeches, where his aim was to align himself with his audience and where any display of learning or hint of pedantry would have been out of place. The only certain exception is Cicero's citation in a courtroom speech of a pronouncement made by Cato in the prologue to the *Origines* (*Planc.* 66=Cato 5 F2a), although one other citation of Cato may also come from that work (*Verr.* 2.2.5=Cato 5 F129): in both cases Cato is cited as an exemplary figure in his own right rather than as a historical source.

In the rhetorical and philosophical treatises, which he composed from 55 BC on and with extraordinary productivity in the years 46–44, Cicero refers to historians more frequently, but once again formal conventions often prevented him from citing or acknowledging historical sources directly. In book 2 of the *De republica*, where he presents a historical account of the development of the Roman state, Cicero (or rather, his main speaker, Scipio) deliberately avoids any hint of erudition, and suggests that he is merely outlining received facts that are familiar to everyone, and is reminding his hearers of things they already know: this is indicated by the frequent occurrence of phrases such as 'as you know' (*ut scitis*).[14] In other treatises, for instance in the more didactic *De officiis*, Cicero sets out numerous historical examples (especially in book 3), but for the most part does so without acknowledging his source(s), apart from one instance where he notes a discrepancy between Polybius and Acilius (7 F2).

The main exception, as already noted, is the *De diuinatione*. Thirteen of its sixteen citations from Roman historians are from the first of the work's two books, where Cicero's brother Quintus argues for the validity of divination, while the three citations in the second book, where Cicero portrays himself as responding with the sceptical case, merely refer back to instances adduced by Quintus (*diu.* 2.54, 59, 62=Sisenna 26 F6b, c, C. Gracchus 11 F1b). The high number of citations in the first book results from the character of the argument which Quintus is made to present: he amasses historical instances of effective divination, and seeks to give them extra weight by appealing to the authority of named historians, both Greek and Roman. Sometimes authors are cited as privileged sources conveying first-hand or at least contemporary evidence: thus Gaius Gracchus is cited for his father's dream (*diu.* 1.36=11 F1a), and Coelius for a dream of Gaius Gracchus that he had heard from Gaius in person (*diu.* 1.56=15 F49a); Sulla's memoirs are cited for a portent that he had himself witnessed (*diu.* 1.72=22 F17); Sisenna is cited as a contemporary source for Caecilia Metella's dream and the prodigies at the start of the Marsic War (*diu.* 1.99=26 F9, 6a). In other cases historians are cited just for the weight of their named testimony, as when Coelius is adduced for dreams and portents in the Hannibalic War (*diu.* 1.48–9, 77–8=15 F32, 8, 14b), or when Quintus assures us that 'all the historians' told the tale of the rustic's dream before the first repetition of the *ludi Romani* and then goes on to name Fabius, Gellius, and Coelius (*diu.* 1.55=1 F15, 14 F26, 15 F48).

[14] See Cornell, in J. G. F. Powell, J. A. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic* (London, 2001), 43.

Almost none of the fragments cited by Cicero are verbatim quotations. The only exception is Coelius 15 F47 (=*de orat.* 3.153), where he comments on his use of an archaizing phrase; also relevant are his multiple references to Fannius' application of the Greek term *eiron* ('dissembler') to Scipio Aemilianus (12 F6) and Cato's description of Sicily as 'the storehouse of the state and the nurse of the Roman plebs' (*Verr.* 2.2.5=5 F129), if Cicero took it from the *Origines*. As was natural for the genres in which Cicero was writing, none of his citations is accompanied by a book number.

The haphazard nature of Cicero's citation practice means that his citations give us only a very partial impression of his knowledge of the Roman historians. Fortunately, he makes many other references to them, which are collected in our testimonia. Cicero is in fact one of only two of our citing authors to have produced more testimonia than fragments.[15] Some of the Ciceronian passages in our testimonia are cited simply as evidence for historians' career or identity, but some sixty of the testimonia supplied by Cicero's works make reference to the authors' historical writing. The testimonia of this type mention thirteen further historians in addition to the thirteen whose fragments Cicero happens to cite, namely P. Scipio (3), Postumius (4), Vennonius (13), Paulus Clodius (16), Aufidius (17), Scaurus (18), Catulus (19), Asellio (20), Lucullus (23), Licinius Macer (27), Ampius Balbus (34), Apollonius (35), Aelius Tubero (38), and Cicero himself (39).

Several of these testimonia tell us much not only about the individual historians, but also about Cicero's views on historiography. An early example is the famous letter of April 55 in which Cicero shamelessly asks Lucceius to write a panegyrical account of the suppression of Catiline's conspiracy, and which also provides our only evidence for Lucceius' historical writing (*Fam.* 5.12=Lucceius 30 T1–3, F1).

The most important of Cicero's testimonia occur in the two crucial passages, *de orat.* 2.51–4 and *leg.* 1.5–7, in which he offers a critical discussion of Roman historical writing, passing a largely negative judgement on the literary quality of all the Roman histories which had yet been produced by comparison with the achievements of the Greeks in this genre. We present these passages in full as respectively General Testimonia (GT) 1 and 2, and also reproduce the relevant portions as testimonia for the *Annales Maximi* and the individual authors referred to. Recent discussion of these passages has centred on what they tell us about what Cicero looked for in historical writing and whether he thought it important that historians should adhere to the truth, and sharply divergent opinions have been expressed (see bibliography). Here our concern must rather be with their evidence for Cicero's views on the development of Roman historical writing and on individual historians.

Both passages occur in dialogues and the argument is presented by speakers: the *De oratore* is set in 91 BC, and the discussion of historiography is put mainly in the mouth of the great orator M. Antonius; the *De legibus* purports to be a conversation between Cicero himself, his brother, and his friend Atticus, and the remarks on historical writing in its preface are ascribed to Atticus. Cicero's main point in both passages is that to write history adequately a historian must be an orator, and that, while the great

[15] The only other such writer is the younger Pliny, whose letters refer to historical works that his friends and acquaintances are producing, but never quote or paraphrase their contents.

Greek historians had met this requirement, no Roman historian had yet fully done so. His starting point in each case is the *Annales Maximi*, the annual record kept by the Pontifex Maximus, and he claims that this had served as a model for the early historians, whose style was accordingly thin and unadorned. In both passages he names Fabius Pictor, Cato, and Piso as instances of such writing; in the *De legibus* he adds Fannius and the (to us) obscure Vennonius. In the *De oratore*, Cicero adds that the early Greek historians had had the same character, and his conception of historical writing as arising from archival chronicling, which is shared by Dionysius, appears to derive from a Greek treatise on historiography, perhaps that of Theophrastus.[16] Having passed this judgement on the early historians, which other evidence shows to convey a somewhat misleading impression of the character of their works (see introductions to Fabius, Cato, and Piso), Cicero goes on in each passage to concede that Coelius Antipater wrote in a somewhat more heightened style, but insists that it was still flawed. In the *De legibus* he adds more illustrations. Some of Coelius' successors, he tells us, reverted to the 'weakness and ignorance' of the early writers, and he names as instances Asellio and Clodius (probably to be identified with Paulus Clodius (16) rather than with Claudius Quadrigarius); Passerat's emendation of *gellius* for the MSS reading *belli* would add Cn. Gellius.[17] Macer, Cicero continues, had some stylistic merit, but also serious weaknesses, but Sisenna easily surpassed all earlier Roman historians. The dramatic date of the *De oratore* would have prevented Cicero from including at least these last two writers there.

Another important group of testimonia occurs in the *Brutus*, which is itself a historical work in that it examines the development of Roman oratory from the earliest times to the present, and is the product of considerable historical research. Cicero here frequently includes references to those orators who also wrote history, and treats their histories as evidence of their rhetorical skill. The orator-historians who receive entries of this kind are: Cato (T16a=*Brut.* 66), the obscure P. Scipio (T1=*Brut.* 77), Postumius (T4=*Brut.* 81), Fannius (T2=*Brut.* 101), Coelius (T3=*Brut.* 102), Piso (T3=*Brut.* 106), Scaurus (T1=*Brut.* 112, 132), Catulus (T1=*Brut.* 132–3), Sisenna (T7=*Brut.* 228), and Caesar (*Brut.* 262). Several of these notices pass judgements on the literary qualities of the works in question similar to those conveyed in the *De oratore* and *De legibus*: thus the shortcomings of Fannius' and Piso's works are stressed, and he tells us that Sisenna's history 'both easily surpasses all previous historical writers and yet also shows how far it is away from the peak, and how this kind of writing has not yet been sufficiently embellished in Latin literature'. A surprising omission is Rutilius Rufus, whose historical writings Cicero fails to mention, either in the quite lengthy section devoted to him in the *Brutus* (113–16) or elsewhere; but this may be because Cicero was familiar only with the Greek version of Rutilius' historical work(s).[18]

[16] See below on Dionysius, and introduction to *Annales Maximi*, I. 63, 156, and commentary on *Annales Maximi* F7–10.

[17] J. G. F. Powell in his *OCT* and A. R. Dyck, *Comm.* on Cic. *leg.* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2003), 78–9, adopt Passerat's emendation and also read *Claudius*, identifying this writer with Quadrigarius. However, see introductions to Cn. Gellius (14) and Paulus Clodius (16).

[18] As suggested by G. L. Hendrickson, *CPh* 28 (1933), 167–75.

Thus Cicero through his citations and other allusions shows familiarity with, or at least knowledge of, a wide range of works on Roman history, including the majority of those that had been written by his time. There are, however, some notable historians to whose work he never refers: these include, besides Rutilius Rufus, four writers whose histories of Rome extended from its origins down to their own day, namely the early historians Cincius Alimentus and Cassius Hemina, and the more recent writers Valerius Antias and (unless it is he rather than Paulus Clodius who is named at *leg.* 1.6) Claudius Quadrigarius. Cicero may simply have been unaware of some of these histories; others he may have regarded as not worth mentioning, and this may particularly have been the case with the later annalists Antias and Quadrigarius.[19]

Cicero had a good knowledge of Roman history and will have read most of the Roman histories that were available to him. In his youth he had no doubt absorbed Cato's *Origines*, and probably Fabius Pictor, Piso, and Coelius Antipater, and it will have been from them, and also from Ennius' *Annals*, which he knew by heart, that he derived his knowledge of earlier Roman history. Cicero may well have selected these four historians for mention in the *De oratore* because theirs were the Roman histories he read when he was receiving his own education, at about the time of the dialogue's purported setting.

The uses which Cicero made of the Roman historians will, however, naturally have been coloured by the dissatisfaction with their literary quality to which, as we have seen, he gave repeated expression. As Rawson pointed out (*Roman Culture*, 61), his letters show that Cicero could often be found reading Greek historians for pleasure, but there are no such passages for their Roman equivalents. In the exposition of the Roman historians' inadequacy in the *De legibus*, Atticus is represented as urging that Cicero should set the matter right by composing a history himself, claiming that he had been repeatedly pressed to do so and was uniquely qualified for the task. Whether Cicero ever seriously considered complying with such requests is impossible to determine.

In the event Cicero opted instead for the production of treatises on rhetorical and philosophical themes, mostly in dialogue form, but these involved him in a good deal of historical research. Some of these works had substantial historical content, like the *De republica*, with its second book on early Roman history, and the survey of Roman orators in the *Brutus*. In addition, a number of the dialogues purported to be conversations between notable Romans of the past, with settings in the period from the mid-second to the early first century BC, and Cicero went to considerable pains to ensure the historical accuracy of these settings and the accompanying background information. Some of this research will have involved consulting again histories with which he was already familiar and perhaps using others for the first time. It may be that, as Rawson suggested (*Roman Culture*, 64), he made the acquaintance of some of the additional historians not mentioned in the *De oratore* survey but included in the comparable passage in the *De legibus* as part of his research for the *De republica*.

Cicero's correspondence with Atticus gives some hints as to the part played by the earlier histories in his research during the intensive period of dialogue composition in 46–44. He regrets not having Vennonius' history to hand (*Att.* 12.3.1 = Vennonius 13

[19] On Cicero's likely knowledge of Antias and Quadrigarius, see Introduction to Antias, I. 295.

T2), but in June 45 we find him making use of the historical epitomes recently made by Brutus: he asks Atticus to send him Brutus' epitome of Coelius, and consults his epitome of Fannius (*Att.* 13.8, 12.5b=Coelius 15 T4, Fannius 12 T4). Rather than going back to the original with which he had long been familiar, Cicero perhaps relied on Brutus' epitome for his citations of Coelius in the *De natura deorum* and *De diuinatione*, most of which were composed in later 45 and early 44. However, this will have been an exceptional procedure, and, when using historians, he will normally have drawn on their original texts, rather than (as some scholars have argued) on intermediaries.[20]

Important assistance for these later dialogues will have been provided by Atticus' *Annalis*, in effect a chronological handbook of Roman magistrate-holders and historical events. Atticus claimed to have been inspired to compose his *Annalis* by Cicero's *De republica* (Cic. *Brut.* 19=Atticus 33 T4), and Cicero effusively attests the value of his friend's work (*Brut.* 13–15, *orat.* 120=Atticus 33 T3, 5). Although Cicero never mentions it in his extant work, he may also have derived chronological help from the *Chronica* of his friend Nepos (45).

Cicero also made first-hand use of primary documents in his treatises. For the *Brutus* he exploited extant speeches, of which only a few were available from before the middle of the second century, but many thereafter. In the *De legibus* he used the Twelve Tables (2.58–62), laws (*passim*), and *senatus consulta* (2.37). Most striking of all is the exchange of letters with Atticus concerning a dialogue (in the event never composed) which he planned to set at Olympia in 146 BC, with L. Mummius, the Roman commander in the Achaean War, and the ten senatorial commissioners who were sent to advise him in the post-war settlement as the participants. Cicero had been unable to discover who the ten commissioners were, since Polybius did not name them (*Att.* 13.30.2). A glance at the *Annalis* by Cicero's contemporary L. Scribonius Libo showed that C. Sempronius Tuditanus (cos. 129) had held the praetorship in 132, and was therefore probably too young to have been a commissioner in 146 (*Att.* 13.30.3, 32.3=Libo 36 F1a–b): Libo's work, it would seem, could serve some of the same chronological purposes as Atticus'. But the possibility of consulting further historians evidently did not occur to Cicero and Atticus, who preferred to do their own research using original documents (the *senatus consulta* of 146 BC, apparently available in book form: *Att.* 13.33.3), and the personal efforts of assistants, whose task was probably to call on the descendants of likely candidates and to investigate their family archives.[21] The history of Valerius Antias, which was doubtless Livy's source for his full lists of *legati* for the early second century, would surely have furnished Cicero with the names of the commissioners of 146 if it had occurred to him to consult it.

Cicero's likely dealings with the Roman historiographical tradition may thus be summed up as follows. For pre-second-century Roman history his knowledge seems to have been based on Naevius, Ennius, and the early annalists whom he had read in his youth. The only later historian of early Rome that he is known to have read is Macer. Otherwise, when he needed further information about particular details,

[20] See D. Wardle, *Cicero: On Divination Book 1* (Oxford, 2006), 29–30, 37–43.

[21] Thus E. Badian, *Hommages M. Renard* (Brussels, 1969), 63; cf. also Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 265–79.

he turned to antiquarian writings, not to annalistic historians. For the later period (second and early first centuries), Cicero used historians who wrote about their own times (Fannius, Asellio, Sisenna) or about their own lives (Scaurus, Catulus, and Sulla; on Rutilius Rufus see above). The chronographic works of Atticus, Nepos, and (probably) Libo were useful because they packaged received information in a new and more convenient way. Apart from this, Cicero and members of his circle used contemporary documents, speeches, and other literary works (such as the poems of Lucilius), as well as their own memories and information obtained orally from their contemporaries. What seems clear is that Cicero did not turn to the annalists writing in his lifetime in order to discover historical facts. If (as seems likely) he had some knowledge of the works of Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias, he chose not to mention them, presumably because he considered them to have little or no literary merit and to be of little use for any other purpose.

On Cicero's knowledge and use of the Roman historians see especially R. Schütz, *Ciceros historische Kentnisse* (Berlin, 1913); M. Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine* (Paris, 1952); E. Rawson, 'Cicero the historian and Cicero the antiquarian', *JRS* 62 (1972), 33–45 (=Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 58–79); M. Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker* (Stuttgart, 1993). On Cicero's views about the requirements for historical writing see the divergent interpretations of e.g. P. A. Brunt, 'Cicero and Historiography', in *Φιλίας Χάριν, Festschrift E. Manni* (Rome, 1980), 309–40 (=Brunt, *Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford, 1993), 181–209 and J. Marincola (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford, 2011), 207–40); Woodman, *Rhetoric*, 70–116; M. Fox, *Cicero's Philosophy of History* (Oxford, 2007); S. J. Northwood, 'Cicero *de Oratore* 2.51–64 and rhetoric in historiography', *Mnemosyne* 61 (2008), 228–44; Woodman, 'Cicero on historiography: *De Oratore* 2.51–64', *CJ* 104 (2008), 23–31 (replying to Fox and Northwood).

(EHB/TJC/JWR)

De dubiis nominibus ('On uncertain nouns')

This anonymous work (*GL* 5. 571–94; the title occurs in only one of the three MSS which preserve it) is concerned with the gender, number, meaning, or orthography of a large number of nouns. Mention of Isidore provides a *terminus post quem*.

The work cites three of our fragments: part of Cato 5 F46a (the full text comes from Varro), Coelius 15 F66 (perhaps in fact from Caelius Rufus), and Nepos 45 F15. All are verbatim, without book number. The author will have taken them from (an) earlier grammarian(s).

See Keil, *GL* 5. 567–70.

(JB)

Dio Cassius: *see* Cassius Dio

Diomedes

Diomedes wrote an *ars grammatica* in three books (*GL* 1. 299–529), probably in the second half of the fourth century AD. He is the source of eleven fragments, all verbatim, six with a book number. Diomedes' first book dealt with the parts of speech, and all his citations of our authors come from the sections of this book dealing with

verb forms. As with Charisius, Diomedes may have compiled his work merely from earlier treatises, and his citations may therefore be second hand.

See Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 270–2.

(JB/JWR)

Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (DH) was a Greek émigré writing in Rome during the late first century BC. He arrived in 30 or 29 BC, but the date of his death is unknown. DH wrote works of history and literary criticism, and advocated a classical revival based on imitation of the best features of Attic literature, politics, and philosophy.[22] In this respect he was associated with others, especially Caecilius of Caleacte, who saw Augustan Rome as the ideal environment for the advancement of such a programme. He also knew and counted as patrons at least two significant Romans, the historian Q. Aelius Tubero, to whom he dedicated his work on Thucydides, and the father of Metilius Rufus, the student to whom he dedicated his work on composition.[23] Of the six essays *De antiquis rhetoribus* only those on Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, and Demosthenes survive; other surviving works are *De Thucydide*, *De Dinarcho*, *De compositione verborum*, the two *Epistulae ad Ammaeum*, the *Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum*, and the *Antiquitates Romanae* (*AR*). We know of two further works now lost: the *De imitatione* in three books and an investigation into the relationship between Greek and Roman chronology.

Only the *AR* preserves fragments of the Roman historians. This work comprised twenty books covering Roman history from before the foundation to the eve of the First Punic War, of which the first eleven survive up to 441 BC, but the last nine only in excerpts. Book 1 of the *AR* was published separately in 7 BC, but the progress of publication of subsequent books is unknown.[24]

In the first book of the *AR*, dealing with the origins and foundation of Rome, DH uses a wide range of sources, mostly Greek (twenty-four historians, four poets, and a philosopher), to support his argument that the Romans were racially Greek in origin. Both the number and nature of his citations (often verbatim) impart a distinctive character to this book.[25] While the majority of his sources are Greek, he takes the unusual step of including in the preface a list of his Roman sources (1.7.2–3), presumably in order to impress Greek readers with his erudition and reliability as a historian of Rome.[26] In later books the emphasis of his interpretation shifts from the racial Greekness of the Romans to their ethical Greekness. This is displayed in their moral, cultural, and political qualities, as demonstrated in the growth of their power and their largely peaceful resolution of internal conflict.

[22] For DH's Atticism see C. C. de Jonge, *Between Grammar and Rhetoric* (Leiden, 2008), 9–20.

[23] For DH's network see de Jonge, ibid. 25–34.

[24] Consular date 7 BC at 1.3.4. Separate publication of book 1 is referred to at 7.70.2 and suggested also by the summary at 2.1–2, cf. 1.90.2. E. Gabba, *Athenaeum* 39 (1961), 114 (=*Roma arcaica*, 122), argues that DH's discussion of problems with the Roman system of manumission and the potential solutions he offered (4.24) suggest book 4 was published before the *lex Fufia Caninia* of 2 BC.

[25] For the special character of book 1 of the *AR* (and to a lesser extent books 2–4) see C. Schultze, *Histos* 4 (2000), 23–4, 30–2.

[26] As noted by Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 322–3. On the interpretation of Dionysius' often misunderstood remarks on the earliest Roman historians at 1.6.2–3 see introduction to Fabius (1), I. 169–73.

DH's deployment of sources in order to support his argument, especially in book 1, is often disingenuous. However, he cannot be convicted of dishonesty in his reporting of those sources.[27] His citations of Roman historians, as of Greek, occur most often in the first book and to a lesser extent also in the next three, on the kings: book 1 preserves twelve citations taken from seven works (Cato, Tuditanus, Fabius Pictor, Cincius, Acilius, Piso, and Tubero); and books 2–4 preserve twenty from eight (Fabius Pictor, Cincius, Cato, Piso, Vennonius, Cn. Gellius, Antias, and Macer). Varro was also an important source for DH: he is cited four times in books 1–2, and once in book 4. The antiquarian character of much of DH's account of the regal and pre-regal period suggests that he used Varro even more widely than this tally of citations would suggest.[28]

With his narrative of the republic DH's practice changes, and he reports his sources only rarely: books 5–8 have only seven citations from three works (Fabius Pictor, Cn. Gellius, Macer), and books 9–11 none at all. Book 12, unsually for such a late book, has three citations from two authors (Cincius and Piso), but there is none in any of the surviving excerpts of 13–20.[29]

In general DH cites a wider range of Roman sources than does his contemporary Livy, who does not mention Tuditanus, Cn. Gellius, Vennonius, or Varro.[30] Like other historians, DH never quotes prose sources verbatim (or in direct translation), and never gives book numbers.

A large number of DH's citations concern chronology and genealogy, no doubt reflecting his lost work on this subject: Fabius Pictor 1 F6a, 9, 12, 14; Cincius Alimentus 2 F2a; Cato 5 F23a; Piso 9 F18; Cn. Gellius 14 F1, 22–5; Macer 27 F13, 16–17. In this context he is mostly critical of his Roman sources.

A second category of citations concerns early Roman institutions and festivals. Some of these directly or indirectly emphasize the effectiveness of early Roman institutions and the extent of Roman piety: Fabius Pictor 1 F15 (*ludi Romani*); Acilius 7 F6 (Tarquin's sewers); Piso 9 F16 (census provisions), 27 (*lectisternium*); others merely introduce variants on the origin or nomenclature of a people or institution: Fabius Pictor 1 F9 (administrative division of Roman territory); Cato 5 F17 (administrative division of Roman territory), 50 (origin of Sabines); Vennonius 13 F2 (administrative division of Roman territory); Cn. Gellius 14 F21 (*fetiales*); Antias 25 F4 (*celeres*); Macer 27 F14–15 (ovation and dictatorship).

[27] For DH's honest reporting of sources see Schultze, *Histos* 4 (2000), 24–30; for DH's disingenuous use of sources see S. J. Northwood, 'Four Studies in the Historiography of Early Rome', unpubl. Ph.D, Manchester (1998), 144–239. The totals for Dionysius' citations do not include the four passages which have been taken by some as citations of the *Annales Maximi* but probably do not relate to that work (*Annales Maximi* F7–10; see I. 143 n. 4 and I. 153–4.

[28] For DH's use of Varro see E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley, 1991), 97–107; see also T. P. Wiseman, *Remembering the Roman People* (Oxford, 2009), 81–98, arguing for Varro as the source for the 'constitution of Romulus' (DH 2.7–29). DH also cites one L. Mamius (1.19.3), often emended to L. Mallius, whom Mommsen (*RhM* 16 (1861), 284–7) identified as L. Manlius, a proquaestor of Sulla in 84 BC (cf. Briquel, *Pelasges*, 391–7). DH may also cite Ennius (1.34.4: emendation of Euxenus). Fabius Maximus, probably Servilianus, appears in his list of Roman sources (1.7.3) but is not referred to explicitly elsewhere.

[29] Cf. the similar analysis of DH's pattern of citation by T. J. Cornell in G. Zecchini (ed.), *'Partiti' e fazioni nell'esperienza politica romana* (Milan, 2009), 5 and n. 11.

[30] Quadrigarius is the only author cited in Livy's first decade who is not mentioned in the comparable part of DH (viz. books 13–20; but note that these books survive only in excerpts).

Variants concerning famous episodes of Roman history are sometimes included and attributed because they provide a more ethically admirable version, and are therefore in DH's eyes more credible: Piso 9 F7 on Tarpeia, and Macer 27 F9 on the murder of Tatius. By contrast, the variant attributed to Cincius Alimentus 2 F4 and Piso 9 F26, in which the murderer of Sp. Maelius was not a magistrate, is deemed less credible than the vulgate, again presumably on ethical grounds.

In spite of the fact that one can explain DH's citations as directly or indirectly supporting his main thesis, it would be wrong to suggest that his selection of material from among his Roman sources played a central part in advancing his overall interpretation. It is noticeable that they provided him with little help in establishing at least the first pillar of his thesis, viz. the racially Greek origins of the Romans. In this context DH cites nothing more than the vague comments by Cato 5 F49 and Tuditanus 10 F4 that the Aborigines were originally Greeks from Achaea.[31]

DH's references to early local records (1.71.1–3, 4.2.1–3, 7.1.6, 8.56) show that he believed Roman historiography had begun with a limited contemporary record of events which was expanded upon much later, and sometimes in error, by historians from Fabius onwards. This was essentially the process by which he believed Greek historiography had developed: early writers collated local records and traditions, presenting them in histories written in a simple style reminiscent of those local sources (*de Thuc.* 5). This belief was almost certainly not original to DH, but a longstanding idea going back maybe to Theophrastus, and had already been applied to Rome by Cicero when he explained the stylistic simplicity of the early annalists as the result of the influence of the *Annales Maximi*, the annual records kept by the Pontifex Maximus (*de orat.* 2.51–3, *leg.* 1.6=GT1–2). However, contrary to what many scholars have supposed, DH's references probably do not relate to that record. We have accordingly included these passages as *Annales Maximi* F7–10, but classed them as doubtful fragments, with full explanation in the commentary.[32]

The earliest editions of the *AR* were based on MSS of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Two earlier MSS, from the tenth (Chisianus 58) and tenth to eleventh centuries (Urbinas 105), coming to light respectively in the early eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, form the basis of Carl Jacoby's standard modern edition (1885–1905; supplement and indexes: 1925), which in turn is the basis for most modern translations. For the incomplete book 11, however, MSS of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had to suffice. The fragments of books 12–20 are preserved in collections made for Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the tenth century and in excerpts collected in Ambrosianus Q13 sup., a fifteenth-century MS in Milan, and its copy, A80 sup. The latest Budé and related editions are a departure from Jacoby (Fromentin 1998 (Book 1); Sautel 1999 (Book 3); Pittia *et al.*, *Rome et la conquête de l'Italie* (Paris, 2002) (Books 14–20)). Based on new stemmata, they again take into account later manuscripts, and eschew many of the corrections of Jacoby and others.

There are few studies devoted to Dionysius as historian, and there is no standard commentary on the *AR*. V. Fromentin, A. Schnäbele, *Les Antiquités romaines, Livre I et II* (Paris, 1990) has translation and useful notes. Important recent works:

[31] But note that DH ignores Acilius 7 F7, which claims Rome as a Greek foundation (cf. Commentary).
[32] See introduction to *Annales Maximi*, I. 143, and commentary on *Annales Maximi* F7–10.

C. Schultze, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and his audience', in I. S. Moxon *et al.* (eds.), *Past Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1986), 121–41; E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley, 1991), revised as *Dionigi e la Storia di Roma Arcaica* (Bari, 1996); C. Schultze, 'Authority, originality and competence in the *Roman Archaeology* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *Histos* 4 (2000), 6–49; A. Delcourt, *Lecture des Antiquités romaines de Denys d'Halicarnasse. Un historien entre deux mondes* (Brussels, 2005). The greater interest in DH of francophone scholars is reflected in publication of the proceedings of four colloquia: 'Autour de Denys d'Halicarnasse', *MEFRA* 101 (1989); P. M. Martin (ed.), 'Denys d'Halicarnasse, historien des origines de Rome', *Pallas* 39 (1993); S. Pittia (ed.), 'Denys d'Halicarnasse: historien de l'Italie', *Pallas* 53 (2000); S. Pittia (ed.), *Fragments d'historiens Grecs. Autour de Denys d'Halicarnasse* (Rome, 2002).

(SJN)

Donatus

Aelius Donatus was the most influential grammarian of the fourth century AD. Probably of North African origin, he was active in Rome in the 350s. He wrote two *artes grammaticae* (ed. L. Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical* (Paris, 1981), 587–674, which supersedes *GL* 5.355–402), and commentaries on Virgil and Terence. Of the commentary on Virgil there survive only the dedicatory epistle, the 'life' of Virgil, taken from Suetonius, and the introduction to the *Eclogues*, but the work had wide influence, and was drawn on particularly by Servius and Servius Danielis. The surviving commentary on Terence is an abridged version compiled at a later date. The commentary on the *Phormio* preserves verbatim citations of Cato (5 F18b) and Tubero (38 F13). The book number attributed to the latter is erroneous.

Aelius Donatus is not to be confused with Tiberius Claudius Donatus, author of the surviving *Interpretationes Virgilianae*.

See further Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 275–8; Herzog–Schmidt, 5. 143–58. On the manuscript tradition of the Terence commentary see M. D. Reeve, *CPh* 74 (1979), 310–26, and in *Texts and Transmission*, 153–6, and commentary on Tubero F13.

(JB/JWR)

Eusebius

Eusebius (*c.* AD 260–339) lived most of his life in Caesarea in Palestine and became its bishop in 314. He played an important part in ecclesiastical politics under Constantine. His prolific writings in Greek included the first church history and a chronicle, both designed to demonstrate the working of God's plan for salvation throughout history.

The *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books, may have been begun in the 290s, but did not reach its final form until 324–5. It recounted the progress of the church and its triumph over persecution, and incorporated many documents as supporting evidence. Eusebius' *Chronicle* provided the first comprehensive correlation of biblical and non-biblical chronology. The work was composed before 311, but was later extended up to 325 (the *vicennalia* of Constantine). Eusebius' *Chronicle* itself has not survived, and we are thus dependent for our knowledge of it on later works deriving from it, especially an Armenian translation and the chronicles of Jerome (Hieronymus) and Syncellus.

Eusebius' *Chronicle* comprised two books, of which the first was known as the *Chronographia* and the second as the *Chronici canones* ('Chronological Canons'). The *Canons* provided a chronological table between 2016 BC (Eusebius' date for the birth of Abraham) and AD 325, with a columnar arrangement which was Eusebius' own innovation. The table gave a row for each year, and its parallel columns were each devoted to a particular people, usually listing its rulers and their regnal years. Brief historical notices for individual years were entered in a space in the middle of each page, between the regnal columns: these notices included not only political events, but also cultural information, particularly on individual writers. On the left the years from Abraham's birth were entered every ten years, and Olympiad years were noted from 776 BC. Up to 521 BC (the refoundation of the Temple at Jerusalem) the table was laid out in a double-page format, but thereafter the format changed to single-page. The preceding *Chronographia* presented the raw material which provided the basis for the columnar regnal-year data in the *Canons*, and consisted of verbatim extracts from the sources which Eusebius had used and his own commentary.

In the *Canons* Eusebius included a column for kings of the Latins from Aeneas to Amulius, followed by kings of the Romans from Romulus to Tarquinius Superbus. There was then no Roman regnal column until 48 BC, when he included a column for the emperors starting with Julius Caesar (following his defeat of Pompey). After the disappearance of the Jewish column with the capture of Jerusalem in AD 70, only the Roman column remained, reflecting Roman world rule. The final, Roman section of the *Chronographia* opened with evidence on events before the foundation of the city and on the kings of Rome in the form of extracts from the first book of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the seventh book of Diodorus Siculus, and Castor of Rhodes. It concluded with Eusebius' presentation of evidence for the emperors, lost to us due to a lacuna in the Armenian version.

Jerome's *Chronicle* omits the *Chronographia*, but gives a translation into Latin of Eusebius' *Canons*, incorporating additional information on Roman topics, modifying some dates, and adding a continuation covering the years 325–78. The earliest manuscripts of Jerome's *Chronicle*, which date from the fifth century, correctly reproduce his columnar format, which itself followed that of Eusebius' original. Helm's edition of Jerome's *Chronicle* presents the text in this format and identifies Jerome's additions by asterisks. This edition is thus the best guide to the layout of Eusebius' *Canons*. See further under Hieronymus (I. 73–4).

A new Greek edition of both books of Eusebius' *Chronicle* appears to have been produced *c.* 400, in which the tabular format of the *Canons* was radically altered. Soon afterwards this version was translated into both Armenian and Syriac. The Syriac version survives only in epitomes of the *Canons* in two later Syriac chronicles. The Armenian version is preserved in two manuscripts written in or around the thirteenth century which contain both the *Chronographia* and the *Canons*. The German translation by J. Karst (*Die Chronik des Eusebius aus dem Armenischen übersetzt* (Leipzig, 1911)) is the best edition of the Armenian version, superseding the Latin translation by H. Petermann provided in the first volume of A. Schoene's edition of the *Chronicle* (Berlin, 1875). We cite the Armenian version by the page numbers of Karst's edition, and, where required, present it simply by our English translation from Karst's German.

Substantial fragments of Eusebius' original Greek can be identified in explicit citations in later writers, and, more extensively, in passages in later chronographers which are not expressly ascribed to Eusebius, but which can be shown to derive from his work through correspondence in content and phrasing with the Armenian translation and Jerome's chronicle. The most important of these sources is Syncellus, whose work includes extensive passages deriving from both books of Eusebius' *Chronicle*. See further on Syncellus (I. 130).

For Eusebius' *Chronographia* our principal witnesses are thus the Armenian translation and Syncellus: the Armenian version provides the structure and substance of the text, and Syncellus often enables the original Greek to be deduced. For the *Canons* Jerome alone displays the formatting, but for the substance his evidence can be controlled from Greek, Armenian, and Syriac sources.

The extracts from Dionysius and Diodorus in the *Chronographia* both include citations of our fragments. The extract from Dionysius preserves fragments of Fabius, Cincius, and Cato (Euseb. *chron.* 135 = Syncell. 228: Fabius (1) F5a, Cincius (2) F2a, Cato (5) F13a), but, since Dionysius' text is itself extant (1.74.1–2), the citations deriving from Eusebius have no independent value. However, book 7 of Diodorus' history is lost, and Eusebius' citation as preserved in the Armenian version (136–7) and (partially) in Syncellus (229–30) is thus our source for Fabius Pictor's account of the sow portent and the foundation of Alba (1 F3).

Eusebius reported Bruttius' account of the Domitianic persecution both in his *Ecclesiastical History* and in the *Chronicle* (Bruttius 98 F3).

On Eusebius' *Chronicle* see A. A. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg and London, 1979), esp. 29–83, 128–68; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, 1981), 111–20; R. W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, vol. 1, *The Chronici Canones of Eusebius of Caesarea: Content and Chronology, AD 282–325* (Stuttgart, 1999), and 'Jerome explained: an introduction to his *Chronicle* and a guide to its use', *AHB* 16 (2002), 1–32; A. T. Grafton, M. Williams, *Researching Revelation: Origen, Eusebius and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2006), 133–77; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 29–32; P. Christesen, *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History* (Cambridge, 2007), 232–43.

(JWR)

EUTROPIUS

Eutropius served in Julian's Persian campaign (AD 363) and was *magister memoriae* of Valens. His *Breviarium ab urbe condita* is a summary history of Rome in ten short books from the foundation to his own time. For republican history he drew his material from Livy. As with Orosius and the Livian *periochae*, it is disputed whether he used Livy directly or via an epitome (see on Livy, I. 83 n. 88). Like these sources, Eutropius (3.5) reproduces Livy's citation of Fabius (1 F21a) on Roman manpower at the time of the Gallic invasion of 225 BC, but this is Eutropius' only citation of our fragments.

Eutropius' *Breviarium* is translated with introduction and commentary by H. W. Bird (Translated Texts for Historians 14, Liverpool, 1993).

(JWR)

Festus

Sex. Pompeius Festus is known as the author of a partially preserved Latin dictionary, compiled probably in the second century AD (although the evidence for this dating is thin). Nothing whatever is known about him other than the work itself, part of which survives in the badly mutilated *codex Farnesianus*, an eleventh-century manuscript containing less than half the work (entries beginning with letters from M to T). At the time of its rediscovery in the fifteenth century the codex had also been seriously damaged by fire, which had destroyed most of the outer column on each page. The further loss, at the end of the century, of three of the sixteen surviving quaternions can only partially be rectified by manuscript copies ('apographs') made in the interim. Apart from this our knowledge of Festus depends on an eighth-century epitome, made for Charlemagne's library by Paul the Deacon, which survives complete in a number of manuscripts (referred to in this work as 'Paul. Fest.'). Comparison of Paul's text with corresponding sections of the Farnesianus shows that he drastically reduced Festus' work, which had filled twenty books, by leaving out many of his entries altogether, and omitting many of the quotations from what remained. Finally, some remnants can be found in medieval glossaries, scholia, and other texts which are believed to have drawn upon the now lost parts of Festus (for an example see Cato 5 F74 with comm.). These were collected and integrated into an expanded edition of Festus by Lindsay in *Glossaria Latina* 4 (Paris, 1930); but Lindsay's methods have attracted criticism, and his conclusions remain controversial.[33]

Festus' dictionary was itself based heavily on the even larger work *On the Meaning of Words* (*De uerborum significatu*) by the Augustan scholar Verrius Flaccus (on whom see I. Appendix 1, A39 and Suet. *gramm.* 17). Although the text does not explicitly say so, it is generally agreed that Festus' work was an abridged version of Verrius Flaccus' dictionary with a few minimal additions and revisions.[34] The entries in Festus are arranged in rough alphabetical order. That is to say, some sections are alphabetized up to the second or third letter, but elsewhere the alphabetizing ceases after the initial letter and entries are ordered instead by theme or in groups where all the quotations are from the same source. Whatever the explanation for this feature, the important point for the present purpose is that Festus, no doubt following Verrius, filled his entries with quotations from earlier Latin writers to illustrate their usage of words. The most striking thing about these quotations is that the overwhelming majority are taken from early writers of the third and second centuries BC, especially dramatists and poets, from Livius Andronicus and Naevius to Lucilius and Accius.[35] Prose authors in general are in the minority and are quoted very rarely, with the exception of Cato, who appears regularly and often: we know that Verrius had a special interest in Cato's use of language (Gellius 17.6 refers to a work, in at least two books, *De obscuris*

[33] See G. Goetz, *Gnomon* 8 (1932), 258–65; C. Woods in F. Glinister, C. Woods (eds.), *Verrius, Festus and Paul* (London, 2007), 128–35.

[34] Some scholars allow Festus a more substantial and independent role in the composition of the work: A. Moscadi *GIF* 31 (1979), 17–36; A. Grandazzi, *REL* 69 (1991), 101–23.

[35] The pattern of Festus' quotations is clearly tabulated by J. A. North, in Glinister, Woods (eds.), *Verrius, Festus and Paul*, 49. The whole of North's contribution ('Why does Festus quote what he quotes?', 49–68) is important in the present context.

Catonis: 'On Cato's Obscure Usages'). Most of Festus' quotations of Cato are taken from speeches, but nine certainly and two possibly (5 F138–9) are from the *Origines*; another possible fragment is quoted by Paul (F140).

Apart from Cato, historians are quoted extremely rarely. There is one certain fragment of Coelius (15 F45) and a possible one at 192, where Scaliger suggested *Coe>lius historiarum<* . . . (the only realistic alternative is *Gel>lius historiarum<* . . . , as proposed by Mercklin): see commentary on Coelius 15 F64. A fragment of Sisenna is quoted by Paul (26 F139), and it may be that Orsini was right to restore *Cornel<ius Sisenna histor. lib.> iiii* at Festus 448 (=Sisenna 26 F127). In every one of these cases, it seems, Festus gave the name of the author, the title of the work, and the book number; Paul gives only the author's name. All quotations are verbatim, with the single exception of the very curious passage of Festus 150 which summarizes the story of the Mamertini as told by Alfius in the first book of his *Carthaginian War* (see the introduction to Alfius 69, and the commentary on F1).

Basic discussions include R. Kriegsbammer, *De Varronis et Verrii fontibus quaestiones selectae* (Leipzig, 1903); A. Dihle, 'M. Verrius Flaccus', *RE* 8 A2 (1958), 1636–45; P. L. Schmidt in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 240–5. For discussion of all matters treated here, including the history of the text and the relationship between the three authors named in its title, see F. Glinister, C. Woods (eds.), *Verrius, Festus and Paul* (London, 2007), a preliminary publication by a London-based team that is working on a new critical edition of Festus, with English translation and commentary: the Festus Lexicon Project (FLP).

(TJC)

Frontinus

Sex. Julius Frontinus was a senator who enjoyed a distinguished career under the Flavians, and is described by Pliny as one of the most highly regarded men of his time (*epist.* 5.1.5). He was three times consul (72 or 73, 98, and 100) and an energetic and successful governor of Britain from 74 to 77. His many technical treatises include the two books *De aquis urbis Romae* ('On the Aqueducts of the City of Rome') reflecting his experience as *curator aquarum* under Nerva in 97, and the 'Stratagems' (*Strategemata*) in four books. The first of these is a uniquely important account of the history, maintenance, and administration of Rome's water supply. It cites numerous official documents, laws, and senatorial decrees, but only one literary source, the historian Fenestella, concerning the cost of the Aqua Marcia (Fenestella 70 F12, but see commentary for the suggestion that Fenestella may lie behind the whole account of the construction of the aqueduct). The *Strategemata* consists of hundreds of examples of stratagems adopted by famous generals in Greek and Roman history. Some of them may have been borrowed from earlier collections, such as Valerius Maximus, but the majority were probably taken directly from the pages of historians. It is therefore deeply to be regretted that Frontinus does not normally acknowledge his sources. No doubt many of his examples were taken from Livy (who is acknowledged by name in two passages: 2.5.31 and 34), but some do not match the corresponding account in Livy and must be taken from other historians, including the lost works that feature in this edition. Unfortunately Frontinus names these other historians only twice, both times citing autobiographical narratives by the generals themselves: Cato 5 F134

and Scaurus 18 F5. The Cato fragment is one of eleven entries in the *Strategemata* featuring Cato, most if not all of which derive ultimately from Cato's own writings; unfortunately it is hard to decide which ones, if any, come from the *Origines* (as opposed to speeches or the *De re militari*, a work that Frontinus is likely to have read) and, if so, whether Frontinus knew the work at first hand.

(TJC)

Fronto

M. Cornelius Fronto lived almost all his life in the first two-thirds of the second century AD. Hadrian made him tutor to the future emperor Marcus Aurelius and the latter's adoptive brother Verus.

Fronto is best known for his correspondence, mainly with Marcus Aurelius, and it is this which preserves two fragments of Cato (F106a, 141), the latter not certainly from the *Origines* (see comm.).

Fronto, like his contemporaries Apuleius and Aulus Gellius, was an archaizer, which explains his admiration for Claudius Quadrigarius (24 T5, 7); he is also responsible for one of our General Testimonia (GT5), expressing pithy stylistic judgements on six of our writers, as well as Sallust.

The text of Fronto depends entirely on palimpsests and is frequently uncertain; this does not, however, affect any of our passages.

See E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1980); Holford-Strevens, *OCD*[4] 378.

(JB)

Fulgentius

Fabius Planciades Fulgentius was a late fifth-century writer, whose works include accounts of pagan myths (*Mythologiae*) and a discussion of sixty-two obsolete words (*Expositio sermonum antiquorum*). He has long been suspected as an inventor of fragments and perhaps whole works, and the three citations of Roman historians are problematic: two purport to come from Fenestella (70 F32–3), one of which refers to a work called *Archaica* (*Achaica*?), which is otherwise unknown and intrinsically improbable, and one from Cincius Alimentus (2 F11), dealing with Gorgias of Leontini. The latter might be a confusion with a different Cincius (see comm. ad loc.). It is not clear whether Fulgentius was muddled or mischievous, and he was perhaps both. That he is to be identified with the bishop St Fulgentius of Ruspe, as once generally assumed, is now thought unlikely.

See L. G. Whitbread, *Fulgentius the Mythographer* (Columbus, Ohio, 1971); G. Hays, 'The date and identity of the mythographer Fulgentius', *JML* 13 (2003), 163–252; for his citations see B. Baldwin, 'Fulgentius and his sources', *Traditio* 44 (1988), 37–57; C. J. Smith, 'The *Origo Gentis Romanae*: facts and fictions', *BICS* 48 (2005), 97–136.

(CJS)

Gellius

Aulus Gellius, one of the most important of our citing authors, was born between AD 125 and 128 and spent most of his life in Rome. His work, the *Noctes Atticae*, was

so called because he had begun the project during long winter nights during his stay in Athens as a student in the 140s, and was completed *c.*180. In form it is a miscellany based on notes and excerpts made in his reading, a popular genre in the imperial period of which Gellius' work is the principal extant example in Latin. It comprises twenty books, each divided into short chapters on diverse subjects, with hardly any continuity of theme between the chapters. The work has survived largely intact, although book 8 is lost, apart from the chapter headings, which are authorial and extant for the whole work. The majority of the chapters deal with questions of language and literature (*grammatica*), copiously illustrated by short quotations. However, Gellius also concerned himself with the content of his reading, devoting numerous chapters to questions of history, law, philosophy, and religion, and many of these are illustrated by summaries and/or verbatim quotations from sources. Gellius often recounts what he represents as anecdotes about or conversations with his friends and teachers, such as Fronto, the rhetor Antonius Julianus, and the sophist Favorinus, but many of these reports may be his own (plausible) invention.[36]

Gellius cites our fragmentary historians in sixty-five of the surviving 383 chapters of his work, with only three books (14, 16, 19) yielding no citations. Overall, they are cited 131 times in the extant work; 106 of these citations are wholly or partly verbatim, and ninety-seven give book numbers.[37] Only one fragment is cited more than once (namely Cato 5 F87, from his Rhodian speech, cited at 6.3.14 in the course of Gellius' discussion of the speech and at 13.25.14 for a stylistic point).

Some eighty-five of these citations illustrate questions of language, mostly relating to the meaning or formation of individual words. All these citations are verbatim, but most (though not all) are short and, as with the comparable citations in grammarians, their context in the cited original often remains obscure. Gellius often uses such citations from the older writers (*ueteres*) to establish the correct usage of a word or to defend their usages against what he holds to be ill-informed criticism. Occasionally he uses such arguments to defend the reliability of manuscript readings, as at 5.4, where he reports a dispute in a bookshop as to whether the reading *duouicesimo* in a manuscript of Fabius was a scribal error (Fabius Pictor 1 F31 = Fabius Servilianus 8 F10), and at 9.14.1–3 on the various forms of the genitive of *facies* which he had found in manuscripts of Quadrigarius (24 F 18–19) in the library of the temple of Hercules at Tibur.[38] One chapter on a linguistic topic which has exceptional importance for our purposes is Gellius' discussion of the proper meaning of the terms *historia* and *annales* (5.18), with citation from Verrius Flaccus and from Asellio (20 F1–2; see comm. ad loc.).

Gellius' concern in the remaining citations is partly or wholly with their content. They cover a wide range of topics, and are cited for a variety of reasons. Twenty-one of these citations are partly or wholly verbatim, and in several the verbatim quotations are lengthy: their scale and clear context give these verbatim fragments exceptional importance for our purposes. One especially notable group is the seven verbatim fragments which Gellius cites in a single chapter (6.3) from the speech which Cato

[36] So rightly Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 65–72.

[37] These totals include Tubero 38 F18 (6.9.11), although its attribution to Tubero's history is questionable (see comm. ad loc.).

[38] Gellius mentions the Tibur library also at 19.5, on a manuscript of Aristotle he had consulted there.

delivered on behalf of the Rhodians and subsequently included in his *Origines* (Cato 5 F87–93): Gellius' purpose here is to defend the speech against the criticisms of Tiro. Gellius often cites historical writers for illustrations of exemplary virtue or for curiosities, and a number of these citations include extended verbatim quotation: notable examples are the quotations from Cato on the self-sacrifice of the military tribune of 258 BC (3.7=Cato 5 F76), from Piso on Romulus' drinking (11.14=Piso 9 F10) and on Cn. Flavius, the aedile of 304 BC (7.9=Piso 9 F29), and from Quadrigarius on Manlius Torquatus' duel with the Gaul (9.13=Quadrigarius 24 F6), the letter of the consuls of 278 BC to Pyrrhus (3.8.5–8=Quadrigarius 24 F41), and Fabius Maximus' encounter with his son, the consul of 213 BC (2.2.13=Quadrigarius 24 F57). In introducing the two Piso quotations and Quadrigarius' account of the duel, Gellius tells us that he is citing these passages not just for their subject matter but also for the charm of their style.

Gellius also shows some interest in questions of chronology. At 15.28 he calls attention to errors by Nepos (45 F12) and Fenestella (70 F18) on Cicero's age when he delivered the *Pro Roscio Amerino*. At 17.21 he provides a lengthy disquisition on the dating of various eminent writers and thinkers, which includes (non-verbatim) citations from Hemina (6 F9), Nepos (45 F1a, 4, 5), and Varro (52 F2).

Sometimes Gellius acknowledges that he is citing at second hand, as at 6.9.12, where he quotes Antias' use of the reduplicated form *spepondérant* in his twenty-second book (25 F13) from the grammarian M. Valerius Probus, at 11.8.3, where he depends on Nepos for Postumius Albinus' disclaimer about his Greek (4 F1b) and Cato's response, at 13.15.4, where Tuditanus on grades of *imperium* (10 F2) is cited in a quotation from Messalla's *De auspiciis*, and at 15.28.4, where he cites Asconius for Fenestella's chronological error (see above). Many further citations must have been taken from an intermediate source without explicit acknowledgement. However, his indebtedness will not be as comprehensive as his nineteenth-century critics maintained, with some of them arguing that each chapter depends on no more than one direct source. There is no reason to doubt that Gellius read widely and had direct knowledge of many of the authors he cites.[39]

Like his contemporaries Fronto and Apuleius, Gellius belonged to the archaizing movement of the second century AD, and his citations from historical writers reflect this predilection. His interest in the fragmentary historians' language and style is confined almost exclusively to those who wrote in the period down to the earlier first century: of later historians only Tubero is cited verbatim, while the historians who dealt with the triumviral and imperial periods are never cited. His use of the extant historians shows a similar pattern: Sallust, the supreme archaizer, was evidently congenial to Gellius, who cites him twenty-three times, but neither Livy nor later writers achieve any citations.[40]

Gellius' high number of citations from Cato (29, all verbatim) is perhaps only to be expected: it reflects the pre-eminence of the *Origines* among the early histories, and is in accord with the practice of our other citing authorities. However, unlike our other

[39] See further Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 72–80, and *Annales Maximi*, introduction (1. 154), and comm. on F6.

[40] On Gellius' use of the Roman historical writers see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 247–55.

sources, he seems to have been more interested in Cato's last four books, which dealt with the Punic Wars and other recent events, than in his first three on Roman and Italian origins.[41]

The most frequently cited historian, however, is Claudius Quadrigarius, who receives forty-six citations (forty-three verbatim), over 40 per cent of the total of 109 citations accorded this author by all our sources. This patently reflects Gellius' own personal enthusiasm for Quadrigarius, which he shared with other members of his circle. In various comments he makes clear that what attracted him and his friends was Quadrigarius' plain and simple style and the charm which in their view it gave to his work. Thus, in introducing the lengthy quotation on Torquatus' duel, Gellius first gives his own praise of Quadrigarius for his simple and charming language and then reports Favorinus as claiming that, when reading this passage, he felt as moved as if he was witnessing the combat himself (9.13.4–6). Fronto, who in his letters commends Quadrigarius for writing 'pleasantly' (GT6: *lepide*), is represented by Gellius as defending Quadrigarius' use of the phrase *multis mortalibus* and praising his 'restrained and plain and almost everyday language' (13.29=Quadrigarius 24 F78). Antonius Julianus too appears to have had a special interest in Quadrigarius: Gellius opens his ninth book with an account of Julianus elucidating a siege description in Quadrigarius' nineteenth book (24 F83), and in the first chapter of his fifteenth book reports Julianus as making an apt citation from the same book of Quadrigarius on the anti-incendiary qualities of alum (24 F84) and as describing the historian as *optumus et sincerissimus scriptor*.[42] At 17.2 Gellius accords Quadrigarius the unique distinction of a single, extended chapter on selected usages in his first book: the chapter incorporates twenty verbatim citations from Quadrigarius, and repeatedly commends or defends his choice of language (Quadrigarius 24 F1–4, 8, 12, 15, 17, 20–31, with comm. ad loc.).[43]

Piso was another favourite of Gellius': although he cites him only three times, the two extended citations on Romulus and Cn. Flavius are both introduced by praise of his stylistic simplicity and charm (7.9.1, 11.14.1), in marked contrast to Cicero's dismissal of his work as *exile* (GT2). Gellius' eight citations of Asellio represent over half of the overall fifteen citations received by this author, and his nine citations of Antias are the most by any writer other than Livy. However, as noted above, Gellius depends on Probus for a citation from Antias' twenty-second book, and the two other citations in the same chapter (on reduplicated perfect forms) from even later books of Antias (6.9.9, 17=Antias 25 F15, 17) are probably from the same source: Gellius may well not have troubled to continue his reading of Antias into the later books.[44] Like Fronto (GT6), he doubtless found Antias' style unpleasing.

In other early historians Gellius shows less interest. He shows no direct knowledge of the historians who wrote in Greek: as already noted, his one citation of Fabius is of

[41] Books 1–3 receive only one citation each, but Gellius gives eight citations from book 4, twelve from book 5 (eight from the Rhodian speech), one from book 6, and two from book 7. F116–17 cannot be assigned to a book, but F116, on the Spanish wind *cercius*, is certainly from the later books (see comm. ad loc.).

[42] For the special significance Gellius accorded to the opening chapters of his books see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 35–6.

[43] On Gellius' view of Quadrigarius see further I. 30–1.

[44] See Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 251, and comm. ad locc.

a work in Latin, and his reference to Postumius Albinus' history is taken from Nepos. He never cites Macer, and his one citation of Hemina is probably second hand (17.21.3=Hemina 6 F9). Cn. Gellius is cited just for linguistic points and in only three passages, two extant (13.23.13, 18.12.6=14 F5, 28), and one lost (8.14, where the surviving heading indicates that the chapter included consideration of some unusual collocations of words in Cn. Gellius). The autobiographies are represented just in two citations of Sulla (1.12.16, 20.6.3=22 F2, 3). Nor do Coelius or Sisenna, whom Cicero regarded as a stylistic advance on their predecessors, appear to have attracted Gellius: he accords Coelius just two citations (10.1.3, 10.24.6–7=15 F53, 22), and, although Sisenna gets six, four of these are in a chapter which, while assuring us that he had read him *adsidue*, merely calls attention to Sisenna's use of adverbs terminating in *-im* (12.15=26 F129–30, 137–8).

Among our later sources, both Nonius Marcellus and Macrobius drew extensively on Gellius, without acknowledgement: see below on these writers.

We have used the OCT of P. K. Marshall (1968 rev. 1990); of earlier editions the most important is that of Hertz (1883–5): a new OCT is being prepared by Leofranc Holford-Strevens; in books 1–7 it will take account of MS Cambridge, Clare College 26 (C).[45] On all aspects of Gellius the basis of study is Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2]; see also Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi (eds.), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius* (Oxford, 2004); W. Keulen, *Gellius the Satirist* (Leiden and Boston, 2009).

(JB/JWR)

Hieronymus (St Jerome)

Jerome (*c.* AD 347–420) was born into a Christian family, but received a classical education, studying at Rome under the *grammaticus* Aelius Donatus (see above I. 64) and later studying rhetoric. After travel in the East and a stay in Rome (382–5), he settled in Palestine in a monastic life. Jerome's prolific Christian writings in Latin include his translation of the Bible, biblical commentaries, polemical works, and his *Chronicle*. The *Chronicle*, composed in Constantinople in 380–1, was a translation and expansion of the second book (the *Chronici Canones*) of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. Jerome preserved the organization of Eusebius' work, but modified some of his dates, inserted additional information on Roman historical and cultural topics, drawn from various Roman sources, and added a continuation covering the period AD 325–78.

In the *Chronicle* Jerome reproduces Eusebius' citation of Bruttius (98 F3). His use of Suetonius' *De uiris illustribus*, both in his additions to the *Chronicle* and in other works, yields testimonia for a number of the fragmentary historians. His citation of Nepos (45 F13) in one of his polemical works was probably taken from that writer's *De uiris illustribus*. On the puzzling *Latina historia* on which Jerome based an insertion in the *Chronicle* relating to the date of Homer and purporting to cite Nepos, see commentary on Nepos 45 F1b.

In general on Jerome see J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome* (London, 1975); M. Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago, 2008). On the *Chronicle* see further above on Eusebius (I. 64–6), and Burgess's important discussion cited there. The fullest discussion of Jerome's additions to Eusebius is

[45] Cf. Sect. 2.3 (I. 12 n. 16).

R. Helm, *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1929).

We cite the *Chronicle* by the page numbers of Helm's edition and the superscript letters assigned by Helm to the individual historical entries on each page.

(JWR)

Historia Augusta

The *Historia Augusta*[46] (hereafter *HA*) is one of the strangest and most puzzling works to survive from antiquity. A series of biographies of emperors from Hadrian to Carinus (AD 117–284), it purports to be the work of six different authors living under Diocletian and Constantine, although these claims are nowadays regarded as false. However the work came to be composed, no one today believes that the six alleged authors were real people; and whatever its true date, virtually everyone accepts that the work is later than the reign of Constantine.

Although clearly inspired by Suetonius, who is held up as a model (*Max. Balb.* 4.5; *Prob.* 2.7; cf. *quadr. tyr.* 1.1–2), the work as it stands is not a continuation of Suetonius, who ended at the death of Domitian, because it begins with Hadrian rather than with Nerva. But there are good reasons for thinking that the opening part of the work is lost, not only because of the absence of lives of Nerva and Trajan, but because there is no preface.[47] There is also a lacuna in the surviving text extending from the accession of Philip in 244 to the capture of Valerian in 259. These gaps are most probably to be explained by the accidental loss, or possibly the deliberate suppression, of the missing pages;[48] but some scholars prefer to believe that these portions never existed, and that the original intention was to fool readers into thinking that parts of the text had gone missing, when in fact they had never been written.[49] The case for this may not be strong,[50] but the fact that it can be made at all is a sign of how much suspicion surrounds virtually every aspect of the *HA*.

The six alleged authors are otherwise completely unknown, but they refer to each other and to themselves with suspicious frequency. One particularly striking feature is that the first four authors, Aelius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Vulcacius Gallicanus, and Aelius Lampridius, all claim to have written or to be planning to write a complete series of imperial biographies.[51] The prima facie implication is that each emperor's

[46] The title is modern, and goes back to Isaac Casaubon, who used it in his edition (Paris, 1603). See A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), x–xi; the original title was probably *De uita principum*, as argued by M. Thomson, *Historia* 56 (2007), 121–5.

[47] That the work must originally have had an explanatory preface was argued by H. Dessau, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 578–9.

[48] It has often been observed in this connection that Decius and Valerian, two of the missing emperors, were persecutors, and that this may have something to do with the lacuna. It is worth noting that in the Christian tradition Philip was believed, rightly or wrongly, to have been a Christian (Euseb. *HE* 6.34). We know that in the *HA* Decius and Valerian were portrayed very favourably, while Philip was presented as a tyrant. This characterization may have offended a pious reader and prompted him to remove the offending pages.

[49] The preface: W. Hartke, *Römische Kinderkaiser* (Berlin, 1951), 326–9; J. Schlumberger, *BHAC* 1972–4 (1976), 209; D. den Hengst, *The Prefaces in the Historia Augusta* (Amsterdam, 1981), 14–16. The lacuna: A. R. Birley in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Biography* (London, 1967), 125–6; id., *BHAC* 1972–4 (1976), 55–64.

[50] Note the criticisms of Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 95, 199–203.

[51] Thus *Ael.* 1.1 (Spartianus); *Maximini duo* 1.1–3 (Capitolinus); *Avid. Cass.* 3.3 (Gallicanus); *Heliog.* 35.1–2 (Lampridius).

life in the *HA* has been selected from those available in four complete collections. On the other hand the last two authors, Trebellius Pollio and Flavius Vopiscus, are presented as writing successively; the latter is made to say (*Aur.* 1–2) that his predecessor, Trebellius Pollio, had completed a series of lives from Philip to Claudius II, but that he himself was the first to write the lives of succeeding emperors, from Aurelian to Carinus (*Aur.* 1.4; *Prob.* 1.3–5; *quadr. tyr.* 1.4). These autobiographical statements, mostly occurring in the dedications (which are open to suspicion on other grounds: see n. 54), frequently contradict one another in ways that would make little sense if the authors really were the independent biographers they claim to be.[52] The uncomfortable fact is that there is no parallel in the whole of ancient literature for a multi-authored compendium of this nature, and one is bound to admit that the very idea of six otherwise unknown (but extremely prolific) imperial biographers, all living and working around the same time—a time, moreover, not noted as a golden age of Latin historiography—is difficult to credit.

These days it is generally agreed that the *HA* is in fact the work of a single author who chose to hide his own identity behind six non-existent authors. Why he should have done this, rather than adopt a single pseudonym (which would not have aroused the same amount of suspicion, or indeed any), is not easy to explain. But the grounds for accepting the idea of single authorship are strong: the various lives all show a uniformity of outlook and method of composition.[53] Moreover, the whole collection is a work of consistently low quality, by any standard: it is badly written, careless, shallow, and relentlessly trivial. It is also dishonest, in that the many documents it quotes, and the majority of the literary sources it claims to draw upon, are blatant fabrications (see further below).

If the six authors are inventions, it follows that their authorial statements—autobiographical remarks, dedications, and other passages addressed to patrons—must also be rejected outright.[54] These statements contain the only direct indications of the date of the work—namely that it was written in the age of Diocletian and Constantine. They are such a blatant contrivance that we are more or less invited to suspect that the work was not in fact written then.[55] If these passages are ignored, the work must be

[52] T. D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978), 13–16.

[53] The arguments are most clearly set out in a seminal article by P. White, *JRS* 57 (1967), 115–33. J. N. Adams has also shown that certain minor (and therefore probably unconscious) eccentricities of usage characterize the language of the whole work, and point unmistakably to single authorship: *CQ* 22 (1972), 186–94; *Antichthon* 11 (1977), 93–102. Computer-based 'stylometric' analyses, once thought to confirm this view (I. Marriott, *JRS* 69 (1979), 65–77), have since been challenged (D. Sansone, *JRS* 80 (1990), 174–7). Recent studies are less conclusive, and if anything suggest that computers will not be able to resolve the issue one way or the other. See B. D. Frischer *et al.* in *Research in Humanities Computing* 5 (1996), 110–42; B. Meissner, in G. Bonamente, K. Rosen (eds.), *HAC* NS 6 (1997), 175–215; and the papers collected in *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 13 (1998); and note the comment of Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 744.

[54] They also stand condemned for other reasons, including internal inconsistencies (n. 52). Among other things, the passages addressed to patrons contain presumptuous and even critical remarks that could not possibly have been made to a living emperor. See e.g. *Heliog.* 34.5; *Alex.* 65.4; 67.1. Cf. T. Honoré, *JRS* 77 (1987), 158.

[55] It is in any case clear enough that the author is not trying to cover his tracks, but rather to provoke suspicion and incredulity—perhaps even to give himself away by leaving deliberate clues for perceptive readers, as hoaxers tend to do. Thus R. Syme, *JRS* 62 (1972), 123; A. Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 255; id., *Last Pagans*, 782.

dated by indirect inferences. After more than 120 years of research the general consensus is that the *HA* dates from the later fourth century at the earliest, most scholars opting for the years just after 395 or possibly a decade or so later. But while a late fourth-century date is easy to assert, and undoubtedly feels right, it is actually extremely difficult to prove, as Momigliano pointed out in a classic study.[56] The main arguments were set out by Dessau, who noticed that part of the life of Septimius Severus (17.5–19.4) was copied from Aurelius Victor's *De Caesaribus* (20), published in 360, and that a passage in the life of Marcus Aurelius (16.3–18.2) seemed to depend on Eutropius (8.11–14), who wrote around 369.[57] If one or both of these inferences is accepted, a clear *terminus post quem* is established for the composition of the *HA*. Otherwise the argument depends on considerations of a more general order, such as the attitudes expressed in the work and the literary culture to which it belongs. These point to the last quarter of the fourth century or the early decades of the fifth, but it is difficult to be more precise than that. Much depends on supposed intertextual references to other works produced around then, such as Ammianus Marcellinus, Ausonius, Claudian, St Jerome, and even Vegetius,[58] but most of these are patently unconvincing and none compelling.[59]

Whatever its precise date, the fraudulent nature of the *HA* is clearly established. But the nature and purpose of the fraud remain puzzling. No one has been able to suggest a serious reason why someone in the late fourth century should have chosen to pretend to be six authors writing fifty to a hundred years earlier. The most convincing answer is that of Sir Ronald Syme, who proposed that the author's reasons were not, in fact, serious. For Syme the author was a 'rogue *grammaticus*', taking pleasure in fraudulence for its own sake. He had no serious message, whether about politics, society, or religion. In particular, Syme rightly rejects the notion that the work was an anti-Christian product by a committed pagan who concealed his identity in fear of Christian reprisals. The references to Christianity in the *HA* are 'sporadic and equivocal',[60] and the subject 'does not engage any serious or sustained interest' in the author.[61] Naturally he has his likes and dislikes. He approves of victories over foreign enemies, adoptive succession, and senatorial authority, and he disapproves of civil war, child emperors, official corruption, eunuchs, and so on. These conventional attitudes do not amount to much, and hardly explain the author's purpose.[62] Far more

[56] A. Momigliano, *JWCI* 17 (1954), 22–46, reprinted with additions in *Secondo contributo*, 104–43 and *Studies in Historiography* (London, 1966), 143–80. In spite of its clarity of argument and lucidity of expression this article has been widely misunderstood, and taken to be arguing that the *HA* is what it claims to be, namely a work by six authors writing under Diocletian and Constantine. In fact it does nothing of the kind (as rightly pointed out by T. D. Barnes, *Historia* 44 (1995), 499).

[57] H. Dessau, *Hermes* 24 (1889), 363–7 (Victor); 368–70 (Eutropius). For the *HA*'s dependence on Victor see further E. Hohl, *Historia* 4 (1955), 220–8; A. Chastagnol, *RPh* 93 (1967), 85–97.

[58] For a brief statement of the case see A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), lxxxvii–xcix.

[59] Thus Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 747–50, arguing for a date around 380, before the publication of any of the works to which the *HA* supposedly alludes.

[60] Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, 189; cf. Momigliano, *Secondo contributo*, 129–31. The references to Christianity in the *HA* are conveniently listed by Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), cxxxv.

[61] Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, 139

[62] In Syme's words, 'if he be summed up, a doubt arises whether this *scholasticus* had any political or social beliefs of a pronounced order' (*Ammianus and the H.A.* 191).

pronounced is his interest in trivialities, especially in matters of physical appearance, clothes, food, drink, and sex. Jokes, puns, and all kinds of silliness abound.

The most distinctive feature of the *HA*, however, is its parade of pseudo-scholarship, and its mockery of the pedantic methods and style of learned writing. In deliberate imitation of Suetonius, the author cites numerous documents—letters, speeches, senatorial decrees and acclamations, imperial edicts, and inscriptions—most of them patent forgeries.[63] This conclusion is based not only on factual errors, use of language unsuitable to official documents, and highly improbable content, but also on the distribution of documents among the various lives. Documents abound in the lives of little-known emperors and usurpers, whereas those of major historical figures such as Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Septimius Severus contain no documents at all. The one possible exception is the senatorial acclamation quoted in the life of Commodus which the *HA* took from Marius Maximus (*Comm.* 18.1–20.5=101 F16). There are good reasons for taking this document as authentic—indeed as the only genuine official document in the *HA* (see comm. on 101 F16). Marius Maximus seems to have gone further than Suetonius in quoting official documents verbatim and in full (see introduction to Marius Maximus, with nn. 9–10); if so, he is likely to have been the model for the *HA*'s fabrications.

Their distribution in the *HA* serves to underline the fact that the documents were forged in order to provide information about emperors for whom little or no genuine factual material was available;[64] and it draws attention to another important feature of the work, namely the distinction, in the first half, between the 'primary' lives of ruling emperors from Hadrian to Caracalla, and the 'secondary' lives of co-rulers (Aelius Caesar, Septimius Geta, Diadumenianus) and pretenders (Avidius Cassius, Pescennius Niger, Clodius Albinus).[65] These secondary lives were a novel feature, introduced by the *HA* in order to improve upon Marius Maximus, a plan that was implemented and subsequently modified as the work progressed (see n. 61). But the important point for this discussion is that the secondary lives contain very little historical information; they are fashioned from material relating to the 'primary' lives mixed with frivolous invention, including forged documents. The primary lives, by contrast, contain much genuine historical material (and no forged documents), which is usually explained by the use of good sources. The main source of these primary lives is widely thought to have been Marius Maximus, who is mentioned more than thirty times in all in the *HA*. We favour this interpretation in preference to the alternative, that Marius Maximus was used by the *HA* only for occasional additions to the main source, a hypothetical biographer who is not acknowledged by the *HA* and

[63] C. Lécrivain, *Études sur l'Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1904), 45–101; L. Homo, *RH* 151 (1926), 161–98; 152 (1926), 1–31; A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), cxviii–cxxv, with tables listing *senatus consulta* and inscriptions.

[64] This is particularly true of the later lives, in the period from 260 to 284. Since this period would have been within living memory in the age of Diocletian and Constantine, it would be surprising to find such a pattern of distribution in the works of biographers writing at that time. The absence of historical information in the later lives of the *HA* is therefore a prima facie argument in favour of a later date.

[65] The distinction goes back to Mommsen (*Hermes* 25 (1890), 246–52=*Ges. Schr.* 7. 319–25), who differentiated between 'primary' and 'secondary' lives. In an important study (*JRS* 57 (1967), 65–79) T. D. Barnes demonstrated that the life of Lucius Verus belongs to the former category.

whose name is therefore not known (on this 'Ignotus' see the introduction to Marius Maximus (101)).

With the life of Macrinus, the successor to Caracalla, the character of the *HA* changes, and the historical content of the lives visibly diminishes. From this point all the lives adopt the fictitious character of the earlier secondary lives, and the practice of writing separate lives of co-rulers and pretenders itself disappears after the life of Diadumenus (the son of Macrinus)—a decision explained by 'Julius Capitolinus' (*Maximin.* 1.1–3) and followed by 'Trebellius Pollio' and 'Flavius Vopiscus', who progressively reduce the amount of space given to secondary rulers and pretenders.[66] In the later lives, from *Macrinus* onwards, the deterioration in both the quantity and the quality of historical information is very marked; and it is in them, and in the earlier secondary lives, that the *HA* not only fabricates bogus documents, but also calls upon a large number of otherwise unknown literary sources, which are widely regarded as fictitious inventions. We agree: although Peter gave them the benefit of the doubt, and dutifully edited the 'fragments' of twenty-five historians and biographers in *HRR* 2, we have decided not to follow suit but merely to list their names, with references, in an appendix (Appendix 2, I. 650–1). We concede that it is not possible to achieve certainty in every case, that at least one of the names is of a genuine historian,[67] and that others may conceivably have existed.[68] But most probably all are fictitious; and in any case we believe that it would serve little purpose to devote separate entries in this edition to authors who are known only from the *HA*, and that the alleged quotations are best obtained directly from the text of that work.

As for genuine sources, in addition to Marius Maximus, the *HA* also cites Asinius Quadratus (102 T5, F6, F25) and the autobiographical memoirs of Hadrian (97 T1, F1–4) and Septimius Severus (100 T3–4, F2–7). Whether the *HA* consulted these works at first hand or indirectly, and whether the quotations are all genuine, is naturally uncertain. It has been plausibly argued that the *HA* took its references to Severus' memoirs from Marius Maximus (see comm. on Severus 100 F7 and Marius Maximus 101 F18), and its citations of Asinius Quadratus either from Maximus or from some other intermediary (see comm. on Asinius Quadratus 102 F25). And although the *HA*'s citations of Marius Maximus are mostly taken to be genuine, this cannot be certain, and serious doubts surround T7 (see introduction to Marius Maximus 101, I. 606 and n. 19) and F2 (see comm. ad loc.); it is also not at all clear that

[66] The difficulty of finding enough material for secondary lives had already been raised by 'Aelius Spartianus' (*Geta* 1.1–2), and the possibility of abandoning the practice by 'Julius Capitolinus' (*Diad.* 6.1). Thus all the alleged *scriptores* were involved in this developing process. To put it another way, the author of the *HA* had evidently forgotten that he was supposed to be six different authors. This is one of the most powerful arguments for single authorship, as noted by P. White, *JRS* 57 (1967) 120–3; cf. Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 744.

[67] Onesimus of Cyprus or Sparta is known as a historian of Constantine (*FGrHist* 216 T1), but the passages attributed to him in the *HA* are probably nonetheless fictitious: Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 278; Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 781.

[68] e.g. Gargilius Martialis, known as a writer on gardens and the medicinal uses of plants (Cassiod. *Inst.* 1.28.5), partially still extant. He may be identical with the Roman knight Q. Gargilius Martialis (*PIR*^{2} G82) commemorated in *ILS* 2767 (AD 260), but whether this evidence authenticates the reference to a life of Alexander Severus (*H.A* | Lampr. | *Alex.* 37.9; cf. | Vopisc. | *Prob.* 2.7) is another matter.

the *HA* has fairly represented Marius Maximus, who is frequently disparaged as a competitor whom the *scriptores* hope to surpass. Asinius Quadratus 102 F6 may also be an instance where a bogus citation is attributed to a genuine author (see comm. ad loc.).

The *HA* shows some knowledge of Greek culture and also claims to have made use of Greek sources (of whom Asinius Quadratus was one). At the start of *Aurelian* 'Vopiscus' states that although there was no Latin biography of the emperor there were several Greek ones, three of which he later quotes: Asclepiodotus (44.2), Callicrates of Tyre (4.2), and Theoclius (6.3). These and similar bogus references have suggested to Alan Cameron that the author of the *HA* might have been inspired by a well-established Greek tradition of fictional historiography and mythography, as represented by the *New History* of Ptolemy Chennos, ps.-Plutarch's *Parallela Minora*, and the *Alexander Romance*, all of which are full of fictitious source references and playful pseudo-scholarship.[69]

However that may be (and it is an attractive idea that lends powerful support to Syme's reconstruction of the mentality of the *HA*), there can be no doubt that the author of the *HA* knew Greek and was able to draw on genuine Greek sources. Two in particular are quoted more frequently than any other genuine source (apart from Marius Maximus), namely Herodian and Dexippus, who were used for the period to 238 in the former case and from 238 to 270 in the latter.[70] The citations of Herodian are especially important because they can be checked against his extant text. They are mostly genuine and accurate, although at [Capit.] *Maximin.* 13.3–4 Herodian's view of Maximinus is grossly misrepresented. Greek sources also seem to have supplied most of the little factual information in the lives of Aurelian, Tacitus, and Probus.[71] That the *HA* made use of Cassius Dio is also possible.[72]

Whether the *HA* used fourth-century sources later than the purported time of writing is naturally a matter of inference and inevitably controversial. The case for saying that it drew occasionally on Aurelius Victor and Eutropius is strong, as we have seen. Moreover, the case for dating the *HA* to the end of the fourth century depends in part on the belief that it contains echoes of Ammianus Marcellinus;[73] and since the first part of Ammianus' work (in the now lost books 1–13) covered the history of the period from Nerva to Constantius, one would expect the author of the *HA* to have made some use of it had it been available. On the other hand, the absence of any obvious sign that he did so might perhaps suggest, on the contrary, that the *HA* was written before Ammianus.[74] Another possible source is the so-called *Kaisergeschichte* (*KG*), a lost collection of imperial biographies famously postulated by

[69] Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 778–81; on the genre see his *Greek Mythography*.

[70] The references to Herodian and Dexippus are conveniently tabulated in A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), lxi–lxv.

[71] E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911), 189–91; W. H. Fisher, *JRS* 19 (1929), 126–9, 138–9.

[72] F. Kolb, *Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der HA* (Bonn, 1972). In general on Greek sources see J. Straub, *BHAC* 1970, 271–85; F. Kolb, *HAC* 3 (1995), 179–91; *contra*, T. D. Barnes, *Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978), 80–9.

[73] Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, *passim*; *Historia Augusta Papers* (Oxford, 1983), 12–30; G. W. Bowersock, *AJPh* 90 (1969), 254; J. Schwartz, *BHAC* 1972–4, 239–68.

[74] Thus A. Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 256–7.

A. Enmann[75] to account for resemblances between the *HA*, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and other compilers. If the case for the *KG* is sound, as is widely accepted, it follows, *ex hypothesi*, that it too was among the sources of the *HA*.[76]

The author displays a fair degree of knowledge of classical literature, and refers or alludes frequently to Cicero, Sallust, Terence, Virgil, Juvenal, and so on. Whether this points to wide reading and deep culture is disputed,[77] but it seems likely that his few references to republican historians are based on second-hand sources rather than direct knowledge of the texts. One could hardly infer from [Vopisc.] *Tac.* 1.1 that he had consulted the text of the *Annales Maximi* (cf. comm. on *Annales Maximi* F4), or that he had ever held a copy of Cornelius Balbus' history (41 T1). The citation of Sallust, Cato, and Gellius at [Vopisc.] *Prob.* 1.1 deals with a commonplace and is almost certainly at second hand (see comm. on Cato 5 F126 and Gellius 14 F31).

The *HA* does not normally cite historical sources verbatim, although the senatorial acclamation of 193, if copied from Marius Maximus (101 F16) as the author claims, would represent an exception (cf. also F8 and F14). He occasionally gives titles, by specifying which of Marius Maximus' *uitae* he is citing (101 T6, 7; F11, 12a, 17), and twice appears to give a book number (101 T6, F12a).

Authoritative introductions to the problems of the *HA* include H. Dessau, *Hermes* 24 (1889), 337–92; E. Hohl, *Hermes* 55 (1920), 296–310; *Klio* 27 (1934), 149–64; A. Momigliano, *JWCI* 17 (1954), 22–46 (=*Secondo contributo*, 105–43); A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), ix–clxxviii; Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 743–82. On the sources see T. D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978). For an understanding of the writer and his outlook the work of Sir Ronald Syme remains fundamental: *Ammianus and the HA* (Oxford, 1968); *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1973); *Historia Augusta Papers* (Oxford, 1983). On the transmission of the text see P. K. Marshall in *Texts and Transmission*, 354–6.

(TJC)

Isidore

St Isidore became bishop of Seville in AD 600/1 and died in 636. His encyclopedic *Etymologiae* (or *Origines*), edited in twenty books after his death by Braulio, bishop of Zaragoza, was by far the longest work in a vast output which included historical, chronological, and theological writings. It preserves four of our fragments (one of which may have been added by Braulio; see commentary on Fabius Pictor 1 F32); three are verbatim, but none has a book number. Among other sources, Isidore drew extensively for this work on the Virgil commentaries of Donatus and Servius.

See S. A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006).

(JB/JWR)

Jerome: *see* Hieronymus

[75] A. Enmann, *Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch 'De uiris illustribus urbis Romae'*, *Philologus* Suppl. 4.3 (1884), 337–501.

[76] Cf. T. D. Barnes, *BHAC* 1968–9, 13–44; id., *Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978), 91–7.

[77] A. Cameron, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 363–77; D. den Hengst, *HAC* NS 1 (1991), 161–9.

JOHANNES LYDUS ('JOHN THE LYDIAN'): *see* Lydus

LACTANTIUS

A pupil of Arnobius, a native of North Africa, but a teacher of rhetoric at Nicomedia, and a convert to Christianity (which caused him to lose his position), Lactantius (*c.* AD 240–*c.*320) was a vigorous and highly influential Christian apologist, whose style made him a Renaissance favourite. His most significant work was the *Divine Institutes* (which he himself epitomized); he also wrote a thesis on anger, amongst other treatises, a poem, and many lost works. Unlike Minucius Felix, he quotes his sources widely, and they include Cicero in particular.[78] Poets are also popular sources, notably Lucretius, Ovid, and Virgil, but also Cicero, Ennius, Germanicus, Horace, Juvenal, Lucan, Naevius, Persius, Plautus, Propertius, and Terence, but possibly largely known via commentaries and florilegia.[79] Seneca and the Stoics are used for philosophy; but Lactantius, like Arnobius, is also fond of generalized references to the poets or the philosophers. By contrast, few historians are cited; only four Greek historians are named—Apollodorus of Erythrae, Heraclides Ponticus, Eratosthenes, and Nicanor—but all in an account of the Sibyls, which ultimately derives from Varro. Livy is only named once (*Inst.* 1.20.2), though book 1 was well known at the time and is probably behind other passages; Sallust was also popular at the time, and is cited at *Inst.* 1.21.41; 2.12.12–13; 3.9.8–10; 6.18.26. There are many exempla in the work, and all can be found in book 1 of Valerius Maximus—or presumed to be taken from the lacuna therein.[80] They are largely trite, however, and perhaps as much the product of general reading; some at least are equally to be found in Tertullian and Minucius Felix. Ogilvie also argued that Lactantius had a version of the first book of Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights*, which is cited in Lactantius' *Epitome* 24.5. Authors such as Verrius Flaccus (*Inst.* 1.20.5) or Sinnius Capito (*Inst.* 6.20.35, from his books on games) may have been accessed in various ways.

Lactantius also used the Sibylline Books substantially,[81] and his interest in the Sibyls gave rise to his citation of Piso (Piso 9 F2) and Fenestella (Fenestella 70 F19a; cf. F19b which is more or less the same information recycled). In the Fenestella passages Lactantius also refers to Varro, whereas he coupled Piso with Naevius the poet. It would seem likely that either Fenestella or another source gathered an account of all the Sibyls, with some variants, and that this was Lactantius' source; the small differences between Dionysius of Halicarnassus' account of Varro on the Sibyls and the account we find here may simply be the products of carelessness. We know Varro treated this topic in his work, and he must be the main source.[82]

This leaves an interesting reference to Seneca (Seneca 74 F2) on periodization. Seneca the Younger is regularly quoted; whether Lactantius was consciously quoting the elder Seneca's history at this stage is unclear and he gives no indication that he was; and we acknowledge in the introduction to Seneca the force of Syme's doubts about this fragment. It would make more sense if it was within the younger Seneca's

[78] The sources of Lactantius are exhaustively studied in R. M. Ogilvie, *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford, 1978).
[79] Ibid. 7–19. [80] Ibid. 43–6. [81] Ibid. 28–36. [82] Ibid. 50–7.

corpus.[83] We are on firmer ground with the last citations, which are repetitions of the group of euhemerist views on Saturn cited by Tertullian and Minucius Felix. We perhaps cannot deduce from the dropping of the surname Severus that Lactantius had spotted the error of attribution of his predecessors; the addition of Varro may not be significant either.

In all, Lactantius was clearly an intelligent and significant writer. It is possible that he did not know that his old tutor Arnobius had embarked on a similar task, since at *Inst.* 5.1.22–8 he does not mention him alongside Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Arnobius seems to know and cite more historians, but his knowledge is also likely to be second hand. As Ogilvie pointed out, what most clearly differentiates Lactantius from Tertullian and his contemporaries is the absence of direct knowledge of Greek, and of much Latin literature.[84] Lactantius is thus much more a part of the world of commentaries and second-hand knowledge than were the earlier Christian apologists,[85] but they continued to direct reading and interest in the same sorts of direction, as well as providing source material themselves, so that there continues to be a considerable degree of overlap in their knowledge.

On Lactantius' sources see R. M. Ogilvie, *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford, 1978). There are valuable notes in the recent translation of the *Divine Institutes* by A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (Liverpool, 2003). For a general account see M. J. Edwards, 'The flowering of Christian apologetic: Arnobius and Lactantius', in M. J. Edwards *et al.* (eds.) *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford, 2002), 197–221.

(CJS)

Livy

Titus Livius was born in 60 or 59 BC and died in AD 17.[86] As various sources state, he was born at Patavium (Padua), and according to Jerome he died there. It is uncertain when he first came to Rome or how much time he spent there, but he was on good terms with Augustus (Tac. *ann.* 4.34.3) and encouraged the future emperor Claudius to write history (Suet. *Claud.* 41.1). Livy's reference to the closures of the temple of Janus at 1.19.3 must have been composed between the emperor's assumption of the name Augustus in 27 BC and his second closure of the temple of Janus in 25: if this passage was part of the original draft, Livy will have started work on his history *c.*27; however, it may be a later addition, in which case he may have begun several years earlier.[87]

Livy's history, entitled according to the MSS *Ab urbe condita* ('From the Foundation of the City'), covered the period from the aftermath of the Trojan War to the death of Drusus in 9 BC. It comprised 142 books, but all that survives is books 1–10, covering the period down to 293 BC, and books 21–45, covering the years

[83] Syme, *Tacitus*, 277 n. 4; M. T. Griffin, 'The Elder Seneca and Spain', *JRS* 62 (1972), 1–19.

[84] Ogilvie, *Library of Lactantius*, 109–10.

[85] Compare our views of the importance of the commentary tradition to the *Origo Gentis Romanae*.

[86] R. W. Burgess, *AHB* 16 (2002), 31 n. 68, argues, against Syme, *RP* 1. 414–15, that Jerome's date (*chron.* 171[f]) for Livy's death is correct, and his date of 59 BC for his birth (*chron.* 154[e]) is at most one year too late.

[87] See e.g. T. J. Luce, *TAPhA* 96 (1965), 209–40; P. J. Burton, *Historia* 49 (2000), 429–46.

218–167 and dominated by the wars against Hannibal, Philip, Antiochus, and Perseus. Books 41–5 are preserved in a single lacunose manuscript.

For the rest of Livy's work we depend on the *periochae*, short summaries of each book probably compiled in late antiquity; the Oxyrhynchus epitome, papyrus fragments dating from the first half of the third century covering books 37–40 and 48–55; and later writers whose accounts derive from Livy, for example Eutropius, Obsequens, and Orosius. It is disputed whether these works derive directly from Livy or indirectly via one or more lost epitomes.[88] For Eutropius and Orosius see the separate entries in this section.

Livy's history belonged in the tradition of histories of the Roman people from the foundation to the author's own time inaugurated by Fabius Pictor, and indeed can be seen as its culmination: with his work Rome at last received the history in a worthy style whose lack Cicero had lamented (GT1–2). As with many of his predecessors, the coverage became progressively more ample as he approached his own time. His opening account of the foundation and the kings is comparatively brief, being confined to a single book. Thereafter the treatment is annalistic, with events being narrated by the consular year. There is considerable variation in the year-narratives for the early republic, but for the much fuller year-narratives in books 21–45 the activities of the consuls provide a standard chronological and structural framework, from their entry into office and early activity in Rome, to their departure to their provinces and activity there, and finally to the return of one or both consuls to Rome for the elections, and the narrative accordingly alternates between domestic events, including much routine detail and recounted mainly at the beginning and end of years, and accounts of campaigns.[89]

In the extant books Livy drew his material almost exclusively from earlier historians, reshaping it for his own purposes with subtle artistry. He makes frequent observations about his sources, noting disagreements between them and/or making reservations about the reliability of their information. He shows particular interest in variant reports on offices, commands, and battle casualties. In most of these passages his sources are not named.[90] However, named references to our fragmentary historians occur in sixty-eight passages in the extant books; several of these passages refer to two or more writers, and in total they cite eighty-six fragments. As befitted Livy's genre, none of these citations is verbatim or given a book number.

Table 6 shows the distribution of citations of lost historians in Livy's extant books across five-book groups.[91] The two citations of Acilius are indirect: as the passages make clear, Livy merely attests that his own source, Quadrigarius, consulted

[88] On this question see M. Begbie, *CQ* 17 (1967), 332–8; P. L. Schmidt, *Iulius Obsequens und das Problem der Livius-Epitome* (Wiesbaden, 1968), and in Herzog–Schmidt 5. 190 ff; L. Bessone, *ANRW* 2.30.2 (1982), 1230–63, and *A&R* 29 (1984), 42–55; P. Jal, *Abrégés des livres de l'histoire romaine de Tite-Live* (Paris, 1984), 1. xxvi–lv.

[89] On the structure of Livy's year-narratives see Rich, 'Structuring Roman history'.

[90] These passages are collected for books 6–10 by Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 13–15. For a discussion of such passages in the early books see G. Forsythe, *Livy and Early Rome* (Stuttgart, 1999).

[91] The citation of Clodius Licinus at 29.22.7–10 must be a gloss (see commentary on Clodius Licinus (64) F1) and is accordingly not included in Table 6. Macer 27 F19, which does not name Macer, is also excluded. Livy 29.27.13–15 is taken as a citation of Coelius (15 F37), but in fact the reference may rather be to Quadrigarius (24 F99): see commentary on those fragments.

Table 6. Citation distribution in Livy

	1–5	*6–10*	*21–25*	*26–30*	*31–35*	*36–40*	*41–45*	*Total*
Fabius Pictor (1)	3	2	1					6
Cincius Alimentus (2)			1					1
Cato (5)					1			1
Acilius (7)			1		1			2
Piso (9)	3	2	1					6
Coelius Antipater (15)			5	6				11
Rutilius Rufus (21)						1		1
Claudius Quadrigarius (24)		4	1		4	2	1	12
Valerius Antias (25)	2		1	6	7	14	5	35
Licinius Macer (27)	3	5						8
Tubero (38)	1	2						3
Total citations	12	15	11	12	13	17	6	86

Acilius, and does not claim to have consulted him direct.[92] With this exception there is no reason to doubt that Livy consulted the cited authors himself. There is no basis for the view, once widely held, that he used only the first-century historians and had only indirect knowledge of the earlier writers Fabius, Cincius, and Piso.[93]

As was noted above (I. 40), Livy cites relatively few of the fragmentary historians by comparison with some of our other principal citing authorities. Moreover, he cites some of these writers only in exceptional contexts. Cincius is cited just on Hannibal's troop numbers, on which, as Hannibal's prisoner, he could have been expected to have special knowledge (21.38.2–5). Rutilius is cited just on the date of Hannibal's death (39.52.1=F11). Livy noted that Cato included his speech for the Rhodians in his *Origines* (45.25.3=T12a), but he may have exploited the work as a source just for Cato's campaign in Spain, the only point at which he cites it (34.15.9=F133).[94] Livy thus did consult a wider range of authorities, drawing on them when he felt a special need, and indeed this sometimes extended beyond historical writers: he adduced a speech of Cato against the version of L. Flamininus' disgrace given by Antias; he deployed a range of evidence on the problematic topic of the trials of the Scipios; and in at least two passages in the first decade he used antiquarian writers.[95] However, Livy probably drew on a small number of the fragmentary historians as main sources of material, and in the extant books perhaps just on those he cites several times, namely Fabius, Piso, Coelius, Quadrigarius, Antias, Macer, and Tubero. It remains possible that he made some use of other second-century historians such

[92] Livy 25.39.11–17 (Acilius F3=Quadrigarius F58), 35.14.4–12 (Acilius F4=Quadrigarius 66).

[93] See esp. S. J. Northwood, *SLLRH* 10 (2000), 45–55. However, Livy's citation of the Greek writer Silenus at 26.49.3 is probably indirect, via Coelius.

[94] That Livy used Cato as a source for his Spanish campaign has sometimes been doubted, but may be regarded as certain: see commentary on Cato 5 F133.

[95] L. Flamininus and the trials of the Scipios: Livy 38.54–7, 39.42.5–43.5; cf. commentary on Antias 25 F49–52, 55. Antiquarians: Livy's citation of Cincius at 7.3.7 must refer to the antiquarian writer L. Cincius (not to the historian L. Cincius Alimentus: see introduction to Cincius (2)), and his discussion of the origin of the *ludi scaenici* at 7.2.4–13 probably draws on Varro (see Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 40–51).

as Cassius Hemina and Cn. Gellius, but the fact that he never cites them counts against it.

As Table 6 shows, the pattern of his citations changes across Livy's work. To some extent this is due to the character of the cited works: Quadrigarius began his history with the Gallic Sack, and so was not available for Livy's first five books; Coelius Antipater's work dealt only with the Hannibalic War; Fabius' and Cincius' histories will have stopped with that war; and the lack of any fragments of Macer and Tubero dealing with the period from the Hannibalic War on makes it likely that their histories stopped before that point (see introductions to Macer and Tubero). However, the citations probably also point to a change in Livy's own practice. Although inferences of this kind must necessarily be treated with caution, the evidence, for what it is worth, suggests that in the first decade Livy was drawing on a range of sources including Fabius, Piso, Antias, Macer, Tubero, and (from the Gallic Sack) Quadrigarius. By contrast, the citation evidence seems to indicate that the only Roman historians of whom he made regular use in books 31–45 were Antias and Quadrigarius.[96]

In the later decades Livy made extensive use of a Greek historian, Polybius. He refers to him six times by name, sometimes in explicitly laudatory terms, and there are further allusions to him in expressions like 'Greek authors'.[97] Although Cicero had recognized Polybius' merits (*rep.* 2.27, *off.* 3.113), it is unlikely that any of the earlier Roman historians had used him as a source. Livy's incorporation of substantial Polybian material into his account was thus a major innovation in the Roman historiographical tradition.

For books 31–45 the passages where Livy is following Polybius can be identified through the survival of the Polybian original, and, where Polybius is not extant, through their distinctive character, which sharply differentiates them from the material drawn from Roman sources. The extent of Livy's debt to Polybius in these books was clearly established in 1863 by Nissen's classic study, and subsequent studies have analysed in detail how Livy handled this Polybian material.[98] In these books he used Polybius mainly for events in the Greek East, and clearly recognized that Polybius' account of these matters was vastly superior to that given by Roman sources such as Antias and Quadrigarius. For the most part he followed Polybius quite closely, though in various ways adapting the material to his own purposes. He made only very limited use of his Roman sources in these sections, explicitly noting some of their divergences (often at the end of a section), and very occasionally inserting material from them without acknowledgement.

Since Nissen, it has been widely held that the way in which Livy used Polybius in books 31–45 was typical of Livy's source usage throughout his work, and accordingly that he characteristically followed one main source for an extended period before

[96] However, the plural in his statement at 32.6.8 that 'other Greek and Latin authors' whom he had read did not support Antias' account of a victory over Philip won by P. Villius Tappulus should imply that on this point he had consulted other Roman writers beside Quadrigarius (perhaps, for example, Piso): see Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 9; commentary on Antias F35.

[97] Named references to Polybius: 30.45.5; 33.10.10; 34.50.6; 36.19.11; 39.52.1; 45.44.19. (Only at 39.52.1, on the date of Scipio's death, does Livy venture disagreement.) *Graeci auctores*: 29.27.13; 32.6.8.

[98] See esp. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen*; Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios*; Luce, *Livy*; Briscoe, *Comm.*

switching to another source. This assumption underpinned the attempts of numerous scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, particularly in Germany, to identify which source Livy was following at each point in his work (a procedure still followed by Ogilvie in his commentary on books 1–5). The assumption is, however, invalid, since it fails to allow for the special character of the narrative of eastern events in books 31–45, where Livy was rightly convinced of Polybius' superiority. Elsewhere, no single source will have seemed so clearly preferable, and Livy's methods may have varied accordingly. It is likely that in parts of his work material from different sources was a good deal more blended and intertwined.

Much of Livy's narrative of the Hannibalic War in books 21–30 corresponds closely to extant portions of Polybius' work: this is true of parts of his account of the war down to Cannae in books 21–2 and of subsequent warfare in Spain and southern Italy, and most of what he tells us of the conflict with Syracuse and in Greece and of the final campaign in Africa is either close to extant Polybian material or appears Polybian in character. There has been no agreement among scholars about the nature of Livy's relationship to Polybius in these books. While many have been willing to accept direct use of Polybius at least on Syracuse, Greece, and the African campaign, most have explained the relationship elsewhere in terms of a common source or by postulating an intermediary. Such hypotheses pose formidable difficulties, and, once it is recognized that Livy may elsewhere have handled Polybian material more freely and integrated it more with material from other sources than he did in books 31–45, they can be dispensed with. Levene has strongly argued that Livy made extensive direct use of Polybius from book 21 on.[99]

As already noticed, in books 21–45 Livy's year-narratives have a standard framework based on the consuls' movements, and their domestic sections include much routine detail on such matters as provinces, armies, prodigies, and the like, material which (despite some distortions) must go back ultimately to archival sources, and in particular the records of the senate's decrees. It has often been supposed that Livy will have found the standard framework and the copious routine detail in both Antias' and Quadrigarius' histories. However, it is in fact unlikely that Quadrigarius' work had that character: its comparatively small scale and attractive style suggest the contrary, and the one fragment which deals with a consul's entry into office (F57) is conspicuously lacking in the routine detail familiar from Livy. Thus it was probably to Antias alone that Livy was indebted for the framework and for most of the routine domestic detail.[100]

Livy's relationship to Antias is at first sight paradoxical. He evidently made heavy use of him, yet his frequent references to him are for the most part highly critical, calling attention to his exaggerated casualty figures and his unreliability in other respects. However, although well aware of Antias' failings, Livy could not dispense with him, for Antias provided more copious information on both domestic and external events than the other sources of which Livy made regular use, and his

[99] D. S. Levene, *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford, 2010), 82–163; cf. 1. 261.

[100] See further Rich, 'Structuring Roman history'; also *BICS* 48 (2005), 137–61; and introduction to Antias (25).

mid-republican narrative provided the regular structure based on the consuls' year which Livy opted to take over.

Thus in books 31–45 Livy constructed his narrative by marrying Antias' framework of the consular year and accounts of events in Italy and the West with Polybius' copious information on the Greek East, also taking regular note of Quadrigarius' version and occasionally exploiting other sources. In books 21–30 he operated a somewhat more complex process, which involved not just these three writers, but also extensive use of Coelius and some use of the earlier Roman historians he cites (Fabius, Cincius, and Piso). For books 1–10 matters are even less clear: he is likely to have made a good deal of use of all of the six cited historians (Fabius, Piso, Antias, Macer, Tubero, and, from book 6, Quadrigarius), but for the more elaborate portions he will have depended on the first-century writers, since Fabius and Piso can hardly have provided enough material.[101] It must be stressed that, throughout Livy's work, it is seldom possible to identify the source of individual passages with confidence except where he identifies the source or in the Polybian sections.

In the lost books 11–20 Livy's source usage presumably continued and developed from his practice in the first decade. Citations in the *periocha* and in Eutropius and Orosius show that in book 20 he cited Fabius (1 F22) on Roman manpower at the time of the Gallic invasion of 225 BC.

From book 46 on Livy is likely, at least for the remainder of the second century BC, to have continued with the pattern of source usage established in books 31–45. After Polybius' work ended in 146 BC, Livy probably made comparable use of his continuator Posidonius. Orosius (5.3.3) shows that Livy cited Polybius, Quadrigarius (24 F70), and Antias (25 F65) on battle casualties in the Achaean War in 146, and the *periocha* and Orosius show that in book 67 he cited Antias on losses at Arausio in 105 (Antias 25 F66). As for the first century BC, Orosius shows that Livy cited Quadrigarius (24 F88) for Marian losses at Sacriportus in 82, and, more surprisingly, Galba (57 F2) for the forces deployed by Pompey and Sertorius at Lauro in 77 (the only indication that Livy used this little-known annalist), but beyond that we can only speculate as to what sources Livy used and how he deployed them.

For the text and apparatus for the fragments preserved by Livy we have followed the editions listed at I. xliv, except in the following respects. In books 1–5 we do not use Ogilvie's siglum Δ to denote the agreement of A and Π, since it is possible that Δ did not exist (see Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 321–4). In books 6–10 the lists of readings given by Walters have been converted to the system used in Ogilvie's apparatus, with the modification indicated.[102] In books 26–30 we construct the readings of the Spirensian tradition from the manuscripts identified by Reeve (*RFIC* 115 (1987), 413), and when these manuscripts are unanimous or virtually so we use the siglum Σ.

There are standard commentaries on Livy books 1–5 by R. M. Ogilvie, on books 6–10 by S. P. Oakley (and by C. S. Kraus on book 6), and on books 31–45 by J. Briscoe. P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961), remains the only substantial general study in English. On Livy's use of sources see

[101] On Livy's source usage in books 6–10 see now S. P. Oakley, in J. D. Chaplin and C. S. Kraus (eds.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 439–60, replacing Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 13–20.

[102] Walters did not believe in stemmatics; cf. *CQ* 2 (1908), 213.

especially the works cited in the notes above. The numerous recent literary studies of Livy include: G. B. Miles, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca and London, 1995); M. Jaeger, *Livy's Written Rome* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1997); A. Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1998); J. D. Chaplin, *Livy's Exemplary History* (Oxford, 2000); D. S. Levene, *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford, 2010).

(JB/JWR)

Lydus

Johannes Laurentius Lydus ('John the Lydian'), *c.* AD 490–560, was born and brought up in Philadelphia (Lydia), where he received a good classical education in both Latin and Greek. From his own testimony[103] we know that he left for Constantinople in 511 and was soon appointed to a clerical post in the office of the praetorian prefect, where he remained for many years, gaining a series of promotions and earning a considerable fortune. In (probably) 543 he was appointed by Justinian as Latin *grammaticus* in the Palatine School, a post he held until his retirement in 551. Of his three surviving works, two (the *De mensibus* and the *De ostentis*) probably date from before then, but the third, the *De magistratibus*, was composed during his retirement in the 550s. All three have strong antiquarian leanings and look back to the Roman past, but always with a view to shaping the present.

The *De ostentis* is a study of divination, dealing with astrology and with portents such as thunder, lighting, and earthquakes; the *De mensibus* (in four books) is concerned with the Roman calendar, its divisions, and the ancient pagan festivals; and the *De magistratibus*, his most important work, is a full-length account (the only one to survive from antiquity) of Roman public offices. Its three books deal with the magistrates of the monarchy and republic (book 1), the offices of the empire (book 2), and the praetorian prefecture (book 3). All three works contain numerous references to earlier authors, both Greek and Latin; and while it is unlikely that he was able to consult all the cited works at first hand (many of them, especially the more obscure ones, would not have been available), it would not be fair to assume that all his references were borrowed from secondary handbooks and florilegia, or to dismiss his claim to erudition as a mere sham, as Stein is inclined to do.[104] There is no reason to doubt that he was genuinely learned and well-read in both languages. Most of the cited authors are prose writers, and include philosophers, antiquarians, and, occasionally, historians; of the Roman historians Cato at least may have been consulted directly.[105] On the other hand the reference to Sisenna and Fenestella at *mag.* 3.74 must be indirect, if the phrase ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς βίβλους οὔπω τεθέαμαι ('I have not yet had sight of these works') refers to them. Moreover in this passage Lydus commits a gross error in stating that Fenestella was quoted by Varro (see comm. on Fenestella 70 F10). There is another mistake in his citation of Cato and Varro at *mag.* 1.2 (see comm. on Cato 5 F13b), and it cannot be denied that many of Lydus' citations are inaccurate in

[103] *Mag.* 3.26. Most of our information about Lydus' life and career comes from this section of the *De magistratibus*, 3.26–30.

[104] E. Stein, *Histoire du bas-empire* 2 (Paris, 1949), 732. He takes a generally low view of Lydus, both as a writer and as a person.

[105] As argued by B. Brochette, *BZ* 91 (1998), 471–4, and see comm. on Cato 5 F3.

one way or another. This can be put down partly to the habit of quoting from memory and to general carelessness, as well as to the indirect citation of sources he had not seen for himself.

Recent studies of Lydus include M. Maas, *John Lydus and the Roman Past* (London, 1992); C. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004). In brief: E. Stein, *Histoire du bas-empire* 2 (Paris, 1949), 732–4; *PLRE* 2. 612–15; Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 306–9.

(TJC)

Macrobius

As Cameron has demonstrated, the writer Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius can be securely identified with the Theodosius named in the Theodosian Code as praetorian prefect of Italy in AD 430 (*C. Th.* 12.6.33; *PLRE* 2. 1102–3). Macrobius wrote a treatise comparing Greek and Latin verbs, which survives only in excerpts, and two extant works, a two-book commentary giving a philosophical exposition of Cicero's 'Dream of Scipio', and the seven-book *Saturnalia*.

The *Saturnalia*, a celebration of Roman culture and antiquarian scholarship, is set as a fictitious conversation held on the eve and over the three days of the Saturnalia (16–19 December) in or shortly before AD 384, perhaps in 382 (thus Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 243–6). Although Macrobius himself was probably Christian, the three most eminent speakers in his dialogue are the pagan Roman aristocrats Praetextatus, Symmachus, and Nicomachus Flavianus. The other interlocutors include the grammarian Servius, at the start of his career at the time of the dialogue. More serious subjects are treated in the morning sessions, and lighter ones later in each day, and the topics discussed include archaic diction and etymologies, the Roman calendar, and Virgil. The *Saturnalia* incorporates numerous citations from a wide range of earlier literature and scholarship, but many of these must have been at second hand, as is shown by the fact that substantial parts of the work, including numerous citations, are taken over with only slight adaptation from Aulus Gellius, although he is never mentioned by name. Other direct sources include the younger Seneca, Plutarch, and the Virgilian commentary of Donatus.

The *Saturnalia* includes thirty-five citations of the fragmentary Roman historians, taken from eighteen authors. Eleven of these citations are verbatim. Twelve give a title for the cited work and a book number, five give a book number but no title, two the title but no book number (both from Cato's *Origines*). Twenty-five of the citations come from Macrobius' first book, in sections dealing with archaic diction, the origin of the Saturnalia, and the calendar. The citation of Antias (25 F6) at 1.4.7 is explicitly indirect, from Julius Modestus. The following six citations (which include all Macrobius' citations of Quadrigarius) occur in passages drawn without acknowledgement from Aulus Gellius and are themselves taken over (not always with complete accuracy) from Gellius: *praef.* 14 (=Postumius 4 F1c=Gell. 11.8.3); 1.4.18 (=Quadrigarius 24 F45, from Gellius' lost eighth book); 1.4.25–6 (=Cato 5 F78, Coelius 15 F22=Gell. 10.24.6–7); 1.5.6 (=Quadrigarius 24 F44=Gell. 1.16.1); 1.16.26 (=Quadrigarius 24 F53=Gell. 5.17.5). No doubt many, and perhaps all, of Macrobius' other citations of the fragmentary historians were in fact drawn without acknowledgement from intermediate sources.

What survives of Macrobius' treatise on verbs includes one (verbatim) citation from our historians, namely Coelius 15 F20.

Macrobius' *Saturnalia* has now been admirably edited for both the OCT and Loeb Classical Library series by R. A. Kaster (respectively Oxford, and Cambridge, Mass., 2011). The introduction to the Loeb edition includes a helpful table analysing the various topics purporting to be discussed over the four days of the fictional dialogue, and the sources where they can be identified (vol. 1. il–liii). On Macrobius' date and identity, and against the interpretation of the *Saturnalia* as the manifesto of a supposed pagan revival, see A. Cameron, *JRS* 56 (1966), 25–38, and now *Last Pagans*, esp. 231–72. On Macrobius' citations and sources see A. Wessner, *RE* 14 (1928), 170–98 (with tabulation of the borrowing from Gellius at 182–3); C. J. Smith, 'The *Origo Gentis Romanae*: facts and fictions', *BICS* 48 (2005) 97–136, esp. 110–11 and 129–36 (tabulating the citations from historical and antiquarian writers); Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 250–2, 407, 580–5, 615–19. (stressing the derivative character of Macrobius' work).

(CJS/TJC/JWR)

Malalas

The chronographer Malalas refers to himself as John; later writers refer to him as John of Antioch, John the Rhetor, or by the Syriac epithetic 'malalas', meaning *rhetor* or lawyer. Internal evidence indicates that he was born *c.* AD 480, spent his early career in Antioch, perhaps in the imperial bureaucracy, and later moved to Constantinople. His *Chronographia* covers world history from the Creation to his own times; the extant version breaks off in 563.

Most of the Greek text of the *Chronographia* is preserved in a single manuscript (O=Oxford, Bodl. Baroccianus 182), but its evidence may be supplemented and corrected from other sources, including a medieval Slavonic translation of Malalas' work and later Greek and Syriac chronicles which drew on it. See further above on the *Chronicon Paschale* and comm. on Macer 27 F12.

For his last four books, dealing with the period from the reign of Zeno (474–91), Malalas provides a contemporary narrative from oral sources, but in his first fourteen books he was dependent on written accounts. Malalas cites numerous pagan and Christian authors in these books, but most of these citations must be indirect, and Malalas probably made direct use of just a small number of Christian chronographers.

Malalas cites three of our authors, namely Licinius Macer, Pliny the Elder, and Bruttius. The citations of Macer and Pliny both come in the account of Romulus in Malalas' seventh book and must be at second hand: the Macer citation (27 F12) seems likely to be authentic, but that of Pliny (80 F9) can hardly be genuine, and may be misattributed. Malalas cites Bruttius, whom he calls 'Bouttios' or 'Bottios', at three widely separated points: on Zeus' begetting of Perseus, on Alexander, and on Domitian's persecution of the Christians (Bruttius 98 F1–3). The third of these fragments is also attested in other sources, but Malalas is the only authority for the first two; if all three are authentic, Bruttius was probably a Christian chronographic writer. See further the commentaries on these five fragments.

I. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (Berlin and New York, 2000) at last provides an accurate critical presentation both of O's text and of the supplementary

materials, replacing the inadequate edition of L. Dindorf (1832). The evidence is also set out in translation in E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Melbourne, 1986), and the accompanying volume, E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, and R. Scott (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas* (Sydney, 1990), provides comprehensive treatment of various aspects of Malalas' work (see esp. 27–54 on Byzantine chronicle writing, and 167–216 on Malalas' sources). See also now J. Beaucamp *et al.*, *Recherches sur la 'Chronique' de Jean Malalas* (Paris, 2004–6).

Although Thurn's edition has superseded Dindorf's, the pagination of Dindorf's edition has become the standard way of citing Malalas, so we have continued to use it for this purpose.

(JWR)

Marius Victorinus

Marius Victorinus, of North African origin, taught rhetoric at Rome in the middle of the fourth century AD. A neoplatonist, he eventually converted to Christianity, after which he composed theological works which are still extant.

Three manuscripts contain what purports to be an *ars grammatica* by Victorinus, in four books. In fact only a small part of the text (ending at *GL* 6.31 line 16) belongs to an *ars grammatica* (and a chapter on orthography, largely deriving from Verrius Flaccus, occupies some two-thirds of this), and the rest concerns metre. The *subscriptio*, moreover, talks of a work of Aelius Festus Apthonius on metre, in four books (there follows, 174–84, a work on the metres of Horace). The most likely explanation is that the *ars* of Victorinus has lost its end, the work of Apthonius on metre its beginning, and that the remains of the two were wrongly put together. A single passage of the *ars* (*GL* 6.23) cites Fabius (1 F27), Cincius (2 F9), and Cn. Gellius (14 F12b) on the introduction of the alphabet (non-verbatim, and without book numbers).

Victorinus' other known works include an extant *explanatio* (commentary) on Cicero's *De inuentione*, which preserves Sallust's comment on the brevity of Cato (5 T16b) and veracity of Fannius (12 T6).

See further Wessner, *RE* 14. 1839–48; Herzog–Schmidt 5. 342–55; Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 218–20.

(JB/JWR)

Minucius Felix

Known for only one work, written between AD 200 and 240, Minucius Felix is regrettably obscure. His dialogue, *Octavius*, pits a pagan and a Christian viewpoint against each other, the former influenced by M. Cornelius Fronto, the latter owing much to Stoicism, Cicero, and probably to Tertullian.[106]

There are few references to named ancient sources in Minucius, as befits his dialogue form. Plato is directly cited, as is Virgil,[107] but a better indication of method

[106] An important study of the rhetorical nature of the argument in J. Powell, 'Unfair to Caecilius? Ciceronian dialogue techniques in Minucius Felix', in S. Swain, S. Harrison, J. Elsner (eds.) *Severan Culture* (Cambridge, 2007), 177–89.

[107] D. S. Wiesen, 'Virgil, Minucius Felix and the Bible', *Hermes* 99 (1971), 70–91.

is 21.1 where Minucius encourages Caecilius Natalis to 'read the writings of the historians or of the wise' and then presents material and argument largely drawn from Cicero *De natura deorum*, *De republica*, and the *Hortensius*. He clearly knew Roman history well though; see references, for instance, to standard stories related to ignored auguries at chapter 7, and to the sacrifices of Mucius Scaevola, Aquilius, and Regulus (37.5), which may owe something to Valerius Maximus; and his section on Rome's indigenous deities (25.8) goes back somehow to the tradition coming from Varro. He does, however, take from the same source—or from Tertullian—references to the human nature of Saturn, which are cited from Cassius (Hemina 6 F1c) and Nepos (Nepos 45 F2c); see discussion under Tertullian. Given how seldom he cited sources, it seems very likely that this is lifted straight from Tertullian, and since one of the interlocutors in the *Octavius* comes from Cirta, we may reasonably assume that both authors shared the same background in North African Christianity.[108]

In addition to Kytzler's Teubner, there are editions with translation in the Loeb (ed. G. H. Rendall; Cambridge, Mass., 1931) and Budé series (ed. J. Beaujeu; Paris, 1964). In addition to works already cited, see S. Price, 'Latin Christian apologetics: Minucius Felix, Tertullian and Cyprian', in M. J. Edwards *et al.* (eds.) *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford, 2002), 105–30.

(CJS)

Nonius Marcellus

Nonius Marcellus came from Thubursicum in North Africa and is probably to be dated to the fourth century AD.[109] His work is normally referred to by the title given in some MSS, *De compendiosa doctrina* ('On Succinct Doctrine'), but *De* should probably be omitted, since while the work itself might be so described, the phrase is not appropriate for its subject matter.

Nonius' work consists of twenty books, of very uneven length.[110] All our manuscripts derive from an archetype in which the work was divided into three volumes containing, respectively, books 1–3, the long book 4, and books 5–20. Although most MSS carry the whole work, the transmission varies between these three volumes. The work is a dictionary, in the sense that it is concerned throughout with explications of individual words, most of which are illustrated by quotations. Books 3 and 7–11 are concerned with grammatical features such as gender, declension, and conjugation. The remaining books deal with the meanings of the words discussed. Books 1, 2, 4–6, and 12 treat topics such as propriety of usage, new usages, words with multiple meanings, differentiation of words with similar meaning, and so on, while the short books 13–20 explain words dealing with particular subjects such as ships, clothing, and weaponry. Only in books 2–4 are the words discussed arranged in alphabetical order, and even here the alphabetization is only by the first letter; it is unclear whether Nonius himself was responsible for the alphabetization.

[108] *CIL* 8. 6996 for the family of Caecilius Natalis, who allegedly and unconvincingly converts to Christianity at the end of the work, dedicated to the virtues of the emperor Septimius Severus in Cirta.

[109] See M. Deuffert, *Philologus* 145 (2001), 137–49, arguing against the view of P. T. Keyser (*HSCPh* 96 (1994), 369–89) that he belongs to the end of the second century.

[110] The books are not called *libri* in the MSS, nor numbered in index or text, though they have an *incipit*.

Nonius was concerned with *auctoritas* in matters of language, which he found in those he called *ueteres* ('old'), mostly republican authors; hence he is of great importance for lost early authors, poets and orators as well as historians. Of extant authors he constitutes a valuable indirect tradition for Plautus (*c.*640 citations) and Terence. From the first century BC he cites Cicero, Lucretius, Sallust, and Varro (he is a major source for the fragments). Of Caesar and Catullus he says *uaccillat auctoritas* ('their authority is uncertain'), citing the former twice (neither from the extant works), the latter four times (one of the passages is not in the extant corpus). In the Augustan period Virgil is pre-eminent, counting, as it were, as an honorary republican; Nonius cites Horace five times, Propertius once, Ovid and Tibullus never. Livy appears on three occasions: one citation, not in the extant text, is to be inserted in book 9, ch. 40.[111]

Nonius' method of composition was established by Lindsay, who showed that he compiled his work from a sequence of lists of quotations (forty-one in all, on Lindsay's reconstruction). The majority of these lists (thirty-three according to Lindsay) were composed of quotations selected by Nonius himself from groups of works by various authors. The editions he worked from will have been annotated, and he is likely to have taken over some further quotations from these annotations. The authors Nonius selected for his lists were mainly early poets and dramatists, but he also drew on Lucretius and Virgil (one list each, covering all their works) and on numerous works by Cicero (eight lists) and Varro (five lists). Two historical writers were accorded lists, namely Sallust and Sisenna, but, whereas for Sallust Nonius exploited both his monographs and the *Historiae*, he used only books 3 and 4 of Sisenna's history.

Nonius took the quotations for his remaining lists not directly from the cited authors, but at second hand from works by earlier scholars with grammatical and lexicographical interests, which Lindsay somewhat misleadingly calls 'glossaries'. Each of these lists (eight according to Lindsay) will have been taken from a single such work. These sources are never acknowledged by Nonius, but one of them is in fact extant, namely the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius. Although never naming him, Nonius also occasionally cites Gellius himself as an authority in his own right, and describes him as *uetus* (on Gellius see above).

Lindsay was able to identify Nonius' lists because, as he demonstrated, Nonius used them in a mechanical and unvarying sequence. In each of his entries the lemma is generally followed (after a definition) by a main quotation and usually one or more additional quotations. In compiling each of his books Nonius normally went through his lists in the same sequence, selecting words for inclusion with their accompanying main quotations as they came to hand, and he worked through his lists in the same order (starting from the point at which his primary quotation occurred) when selecting the additional quotations for each entry. Thus within each of his non-alphabetized books and, in the alphabetized books 2–4 within each letter section, the main quotations (and within each entry the additional quotations) generally appear in the list sequence and, when selected from original works, in the order in which they appeared in those works. Extant works confirm that Nonius used the authors whom

[111] See S. J. Northwood, *CQ* 46 (1996), 309–11.

he consulted directly in this way, and inferences can accordingly be drawn about the order in which the fragments he cites appeared in their lost originals.

Nonius' selections from Sisenna's third and fourth books formed the thirty-sixth in his sequence of lists. His use of this portion of Sisenna's history has provided us with the greater part of what survives from that work. He cites 117 fragments from these two books, from which only two fragments (F9, 127) are preserved in other sources, and these constitute 81 per cent of the 145 surviving fragments of the history. Nonius' method of citation enables us to determine the order in which several sequences of these fragments appeared in the original: see further the introduction to Sisenna (I. 310–11).

Nonius also cites eight fragments from other books of Sisenna's history (26 F3–4, 128–31, 133, 135) and eighty-four fragments from our other historians, but, as explained above, he drew these citations not directly from the works themselves but at second hand from his 'glossary' sources. Accordingly, the selection of authors for quotation will have reflected his sources' as well as his own predilections, and nothing can be inferred from the sequencing of these citations in Nonius about the fragments' locations in the lost originals. Apart from Sisenna, the other fragmentary historians who are strongly represented in Nonius are Claudius Quadrigarius, Cassius Hemina, and Coelius Antipater: he preserves thirty-one of the ninety-eight certain fragments of Quadrigarius, fifteen of the forty-three of Hemina, and twelve of the sixty-eight of Coelius. However, he cites only twelve fragments of Cato, and the only other historians of the republican period he cites are the Latin Fabius (once), Asellio (twice), Macer (five times), and Tubero (twice). Surprisingly, in view of his overall lack of interest in post-republican writers, he cites Fenestella three times and preserves two out of the three fragments of Clodius Licinus.

Nonius' selections from Aulus Gellius formed the thirty-second list in his sequence, and the material he took over from that source includes twelve citations from our fragmentary historians. Nonius' main quotations for five words are taken from the chapter in which Gellius cites various usages in Quadrigarius' first book (Gell. 17.2=Quadrigarius 24 F8, 17, 20, 21, 26), and he cites three instances of adverbs ending in *-im* from Gellius' discussion of Sisenna's use of such forms (Gell. 12.15.2=Sisenna 26 F129–30). He takes one citation each from Gellius' long quotations from Cato on the heroic military tribune of 258 BC and from Quadrigarius on Torquatus' duel with the Gaul (Cato 5 F76, Quadrigarius 24 F6), and two other Gellian passages furnish him with quotations from, respectively, Cato (5 F81) and Sisenna (26 F128). Some of these citations are inaccurate, and in taking notes from Gell. 17.2 Nonius failed to record Quadrigarius' authorship of the passages quoted there: he attributes four of them to Coelius (or Caelius) and cites the other anonymously.[112]

All Nonius' 215 citations of the fragmentary historians are verbatim. Only eighteen of these citations lack book numbers, in some cases through textual corruption. Five fragments are cited twice (Hemina 6 F38; Sisenna 26 F21, 48, 113, 130).

[112] Two other fragments, Cato 5 F77 and Sisenna 26 F115, are cited by both Gellius and Nonius, but in these cases Gellius, whose quotation is briefer, cannot be the source: the Sisenna fragment is one of Nonius' direct citations from book 4, and he must have taken the Cato fragment from one of his other secondary sources.

Given Nonius' importance, JB has collated the manuscripts used by Lindsay, partly in the original, partly on microfilm, and partly from the photographs in the possession of the Dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni (D.AR.FI.CL.ET), Università degli studi di Genova.[113] He has also checked the citations of conjectures in Lindsay[114] and earlier editors (in some cases we give specific page references in apparatus or commentary).

We draw attention to a number of matters concerning our practice in the apparatus:

(i) On a number of occasions the manuscripts of Nonius preface the citation with *annali libro* (followed by the book number): L. Müller, in his edition of 1888, quite unjustifiably altered *annali* to *annalium* on each occasion (Lindsay does not report this consistently).

(ii) With the exception of F^3, corrections are indicated merely by '^{c}'. Corrections in first family MSS which are derived from the second family are usually not cited.

(iii) We normally cite only Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Lat. 96 (G) as witness to the reading of the 'second family' and do not use Lindsay's siglum 'B^A'; Paris, BNF Lat. 7667 (P) and El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, M. III.1 (E) remain second-family MSS until 140M=205L line 30 (*Pompei*; the rest of book 2 and book 3 are missing in P). In this section the readings of PE are cited only if they differ from G significantly; the same is true throughout of second-family readings found as corrections in first-family MSS.

(iv) In book 4 Lindsay, following Onions, regarded P as a copy of Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.22 (Cant.), itself a copy of Geneva, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, Lat. 84 (Gen.). P. Gatti (*Les Manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du moyen age*, ed. J. Hamasse (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1996), 79–91 n. 57), however, reports Bischoff as dating P to the second quarter of the ninth century and Gen. to the middle of the century. The position of P in the stemma must at the moment be regarded as uncertain; we cite it only if it differs significantly from Gen. and Berne, Burgerbibliothek 83 (B; the citation of Gen. alone indicates that the fragment is absent from B).

Nonius has traditionally been cited by the pages of Mercier's edition of 1614,[115] and we therefore give the page numbers of both Mercier and Lindsay, in the form 000M=000L.

For a concise account of the manuscript tradition see L. D. Reynolds, in *Texts and Transmission*, 248–52. On Nonius' sources and methods of composition see W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford, 1901); D. C. White, *Studi Noniani* 8 (1980), 111–211; and the introduction to Sisenna (26). For recent overviews of Nonius see P. Gatti, 'Introduzione a Nonio Marcello', in F. Bertini (ed.), *Prolegomena Noniana* 3 (Genoa, 2004), 5–20, and A. Chahoud,

[113] Whom we thank for allowing him access to the photographs. It has long been planning a new edition of Nonius and is the publisher of *Studi noniani* (15 vols., 1967–97) and *Prolegomena Noniana* (5 vols., 2000–5); see also G. Milanese, *Censimento dei manoscritti Noniani* (2005). In the introduction to *Prolegomena Noniana* 1 F. Bertini announces that in the new edition R. Mazzacane will be responsible for books 1–3, G. Milanese for book 4, and P. Gatti for books 5–20.

[114] See Lindsay's list of abbreviations (vi–xii).

[115] The edition published at Paris in 1583 is also usually attributed to Mercier: G. Jackson and D. Tomasco, however, *Vichiana* 4ª ser., 8 (2006) 111–16 (*non iudimus*; information in *APh*) argue that this attribution is mistaken.

'Antiquity and authority in Nonius Marcellus', in J. H. D. Scourfield (ed.), *Text and Culture in Late Antiquity* (Swansea, 2007), 69–96.

(JB/JWR)

Origo Gentis Romanae

The short anonymous text we know as the *Origo Gentis Romanae* is one of the most controversial citing authorities. It was long suspected as either a forgery (i.e. not an ancient work) or a work which contained deliberately false references, or both. Now it is generally agreed to be a genuine work of late antiquity, probably dating from the late fourth century. Then or later it was included by someone other than the author alongside two other works, the *De viris illustribus* and the *Caesares* of Aurelius Victor, into a single work which gives a complete history of Rome. The compilation survives in two fifteenth-century manuscripts, both independent copies of a single lost manuscript.

The *OGR* provides twenty-five citations from fifteen otherwise attested fragmentary Roman historians. In addition, it includes six citations from three otherwise unattested writers whom we have included in our collection, namely Domitius (104), Egnatius (105), and M. Octavius (107), and three citations attributed to the *Annales Pontificum*, probably to be identified with the *Annales Maximi*. Fourteen of the citations give the book number from the cited work, but none purports to be verbatim. Six of the citations of named historians give (sometimes problematic) book titles. Of the otherwise attested historians, Lutatius is cited five times, Piso three times, and Cincius, Cato, Antias, and Macer twice each. The following each receive one citation: Fabius Pictor, Postumius, Cassius Hemina, Acilius, Tuditanus, Vennonius, Cn. Gellius, Aufidius, and Tubero. The striking thing about this impressive list is that it includes all the republican historians who are otherwise known to have written about the prehistory of Rome, almost without exception,[116] as well as two, Vennonius and Aufidius, who are not otherwise known to have dealt with the period in question. This observation is fully consistent with the statement in the preface to the tripartite corpus that the first part is drawn from 'every history of the most ancient times' (GT7). It should be noted, however, that the comprehensive nature of the list depends on the citations of Cincius (17.3; 18.1) being attributed to the historian Cincius Alimentus, and that of Cassius (6.7) to the historian Cassius Hemina, rather than to homonymous antiquarians; it also assumes that the reference (16.4) to 'Sextus Gellius' is a mistake for the historian Gnaeus Gellius (see the introduction to Cincius Alimentus (2) and the commentaries on Cassius Hemina 6 F3 and Cn. Gellius 14 F19; see too I. Appendix 1, A23). Note also that the reference to Lutatius, Acilius, and Piso (10.2) requires an emendation of the transmitted text (see comm. on Acilius 7 F8 for discussion).

The work also contains numerous quotations of Virgil, particularly in the first nine chapters, one from Ennius (4.5=*ann.* 207 Sk.; Ennius is also referred to at 20.3, on which cf. comm. on Vennonius 13 F1) and one from Sallust (3.8=*Cat.* 6.1), the

[116] The one historian who is not mentioned is Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8), an obscure and problematic author, the character of whose work is quite uncertain (see introduction to his fragments, I. 227–9).

latter being the one instance of a verbatim quotation of a prose writer in the *OGR*. At 6.6 the author cites an expression of Plautus (e.g. *Bacch.* 666; *Stich* 233, 386; *Truc.* 562).

Some of the cited sources are otherwise unknown or at least hard to identify, and, as noted above, we have included three such writers in our collection, namely Domitius (12.1, 12.3 and 18.4), Marcus Octavius (19.5), and Egnatius (23.6), this last for the eccentric view that Remus outlived Romulus. Perhaps the most surprising citation is of Alexander of Ephesus: the first book of his work on the Marsic (i.e. Social) War is adduced as an authority for Aeneas' departure from the Troad (9.1). This first-century Greek writer is somewhat better known as a poet, but Strabo (14.642) confirms that he also wrote history. As Momigliano observed (cited I. 100, 67), it is not unlikely that Alexander should have written on the Social War and, like Sisenna in his account of the war, should have included a mythological excursus. However, this would be an extraordinarily recondite source for the *OGR* to cite for relatively familiar material, particularly since this is his only citation of a Greek writer.

The most frequently cited name is that of Caesar, which appears nine times in all. In two of these places the author refers to Lucius Caesar, and in one to Gaius Caesar. The most economical explanation is that the latter is a mistake, and that all these references are to a single author, namely L. Julius Caesar, the consul of 64 BC, otherwise known as an antiquarian who wrote on religion (see I. Appendix 1, A24). At 9.6 the *OGR* cites *Caesar Pontificalium libro primo*, which supports the identification; it also raises the possibility that he may also be the author of the *Pontificalium libri* cited anonymously at 7.1 and 22.2 (thus Frier, 52 n. 6). This is more probable than supposing that the reference is to the *Annales Pontificum* (i.e. the *Annales Maximi*). One other work is cited anonymously, namely the work 'On the Origin of Patavium' (*Liber de origine Patauina*) cited at 1.6.

In addition to these explicit references to named authors and/or works, the *OGR* also contains numerous references to anonymous sources, in the form *quidam* (*plerique*, *nonnulli*, etc.) . . . *tradunt* (*uolunt*, *aiunt*, *asserant*, etc.), or *creditur*, *traditur*, *ferunt*, *constat*, etc. These are especially prevalent in the first chapters of the work; we have counted fifteen instances in the first nine chapters, but only six in the remaining fourteen. This is one of a number of indications that the work changes its character after the first nine chapters. Another is that Virgil, who is the centre of attention in the early part of the work (the first five chapters, in particular, take the form of a defence of Virgil), disappears from view after chapter 9. As for the named citations, only two prose authors are cited in the first eight chapters (Sallust in 3.8 and Cassius in 6.7). Chapter 9 cites Alexander of Ephesus, Lutatius, and Caesar, and from then on the source references come thick and fast: no fewer than forty-two citations of named authors and works occur in the remaining fourteen chapters.

We need now to consider the vexed question of the authenticity of these citations. One point that can be made at once is that the cited authors and works are more problematic than the material that is attributed to them. This material is for the most part unexceptionable. That is to say, the work contains very little that is not paralleled elsewhere in Festus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or the Virgil commentators, and virtually nothing that is contradicted by information found in other sources (on possible conflicts between the *OGR* and Servius in their citations of Cato

and L. Caesar see below). There are also some passages where the *OGR* has information not found elsewhere, but for the most part such novelties are what Momigliano called 'likely variants of the tradition' (Momigliano, 68). There is very little that is surprising or inherently suspicious, with the possible exception of the final sentence, where we find Egnatius' story that Remus outlived Romulus. This is the only place where the text comes close to resembling the bogus citations in the *Historia Augusta*, say, or Fulgentius or Ps. Plutarch; but it is very much an exception that proves the rule. In other respects the work appears to reflect the scholarly interests of the Augustan age, which is the likely date for its ultimate source(s), since all the known authors it cites date from the republic. The rational and euhemeristic character of the stories it reports closely matches what we otherwise know of the attitudes of the republican historians; and, as Momigliano pointed out (70–1), even its structure looks Augustan, to judge from its similarity to the first book of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

As for the cited authors, they are mostly free from suspicion in themselves; as we have seen, they include all the republican historians who are known to have dealt with the origins of the city, as well as known antiquarians (such as L. Caesar) and the poet Ennius. That some of the citations are from obscure or unknown authors should not in itself be grounds for suspicion; it would be foolish to deny the possibility of writers of whom little or no other evidence has survived. The problem, rather, lies in the detail of the individual citations, particularly when they are accompanied by titles and book numbers. One instance is the epitome of Piso, cited in connection with the death of Aremulus Silvius (*OGR* 18.3=Piso 9 F48); this epitome is otherwise unknown and an odd thing to quote, given that Piso is cited normally at 13.8. But what makes this reference deeply suspect is that it is said to come from book 2. If the second book was still dealing with the Alban kings, it can hardly have been an epitome of Piso's *Annals*, which covered all of Roman history down to its author's lifetime in seven (or a few more) books, and in book 2 dealt with the early republic.

A similar problem arises with the citations of Cincius. At 17.3 the *OGR* cites Cincius book 2 for the story of the abortive attempt to move the Penates from Lavinium to Alba Longa, but then at 18.1 refers to book 1 of L. Cincius for the death of Tiberius Silvius, a later event. But the historian Cincius Alimentus is unlikely to have devoted two books to the period of the Alban kings, or to have inverted the chronological order of events (for further discussion see the introduction to Cincius Alimentus and the commentary on 2 F6–7). Perhaps the most controversial of all are the references to the *Annalium Pontificum libri*. If this means the work we call the *Annales Maximi*, the author is guilty of the venial error of attributing the record of the Pontifex Maximus to the *pontifices* collectively, as many later Roman authors did (see comm. on *Annales Maximi* F1–3). More problematic, however, is his claim that the *Annales* contained material relating to the Alban kings, and the fact that all the citations are attributed to book 4. It is just about conceivable that a published version of the *Annales Maximi* was prefaced by material of antiquarian character on the legendary events that preceded the foundation of the city; but it seems scarcely credible that this prefatory material should have run to several books, and that the fourth book was still dealing only with the kings of Alba! This seems extreme, even allowing for the fact that the work as a whole is said to have comprised eighty books in

all. Although explanations of the evidence are not impossible to contrive,[117] a dark cloud of suspicion must hang over these citations in the *OGR*.

It is probable that the fourth-century author did not himself set eyes on any of the texts he cites, but copied the references at second hand from an intermediary source that relied ultimately on an antiquarian work of Augustan date, plausibly identified by P. L. Schmidt and B. W. Frier as Verrius Flaccus' *Rerum memoria dignarum libri*.[118] It is also agreed that the *OGR* shows clear signs of abbreviation (for an example, see comm. on Cincius 2 F6). The author may himself have abridged the Augustan original, but it is actually far more likely that 'he was abridging an abridgement, in all probability a text already abridged more than once'.[119] If so, we could explain some of the distinctive features of the work in its current form. One of these is the author's habit of citing two or more sources at once. These multiple citations raise the problem of deciding whether the same information was to be found in all the named sources, or, if not, what exactly is being attributed to each. A notorious case is 15.5, where Caesar and Cato are cited as saying that Ascanius was named Iulus because he was believed to be descended from Jupiter, and that he was the ancestor of the Julian family. The problem is that L. Caesar is elsewhere said to have given a different explanation of the name Iulus (DS *ad Aen.* 1.267), and Cato to have written that Ascanius died without issue (DS *ad Aen.* 6.760). An easy escape from this difficulty is to suppose that Cato derived the name Iulus from *Iovilus, and that Caesar declared Ascanius/Iulus to be the ancestor of the Julii. The original antiquarian who consulted the two sources (Verrius Flaccus?) would have made this clear, but in the course of transmission the information was drastically abridged and reduced to a couple of brief sentences, and the sources simply listed together at the end. If so, our author is absolved from dishonesty, and the authenticity of the original citations is upheld. But this solution is only hypothetical, and suspicion inevitably remains (see further the commentary on Cato 5 F6 and 11).

If the author (and/or his immediate source) was in the habit of summarizing and conflating information attributed to several sources and listing the sources together, the possibility of error would have been considerable, especially when copying names with titles and book numbers; and if the copying was done several times the chance of error, confusion, and omission would have increased at every stage. Thus, for example, Alexander of Ephesus (9.1) may have been credited with someone else's work on the Marsic War by the omission of its author's name (thus Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 334 n. 32). Similarly, the story of how Ascanius was reconciled with Lavinia and her son Silvius (16.1–4) is attributed to 'Gaius Caesar and Sextus Gellius in the *Origin of the Roman Race* (*in origine gentis Romanae*)'. 'Sextus Gellius' may be a mistake for Cn. Gellius, as we have supposed, but the title of the work ascribed to him will not do. It obviously belongs in fact to Cato (cf. 12.5: *Cato in origine generis Romani*). As it happens we know that Cato's *Origines* included the story of the quarrel between Ascanius and Lavinia and its eventual resolution (Cato 5 F8=Serv. *Aen.*

[117] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 49–56; Forsythe, *Piso*, 314–15; and see introduction to the *Annales Maximi* and commentary on F1–3.

[118] P. L. Schmidt, *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1602–34, and in Herzog–Schmidt 5. 185; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 41–8.

[119] Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 331.

6.760), and since Cato was cited at the end of the previous section (15.5) it is quite possible, perhaps even probable, that his name has been omitted at 16.4 (see comm. on Cato 5 F8).

A further problem that surrounds many of the citations in the *OGR* and may itself be a consequence of the process of successive abridgements is the difficulty of deciding where the citations begin and end. In some instances the author cites the alleged source(s) first, with a formula such as *Domitius libro primo docet* (12.3), followed by one or more sentences in indirect speech using the accusative and infinitive construction. In such cases the implication must be that whatever is grammatically dependent on *docet* is being attributed to the cited author, and we have accepted this prima facie implication in all such cases, printing the relevant text in bold type (for an important example see Cato 5 F10 and comm.). Subsequent material not in indirect speech may also sometimes have ultimately derived from the cited author, but instances of this must always be a matter of conjecture.

Much more difficult, however, are those passages where the sources are acknowledged at the end, with expressions such as *ut scribunt Lucius Cincius libro primo, Lutatius libro tertio* (18.1). This could mean that the source(s) in question are being cited only for the immediately preceding clause, or for some or all of the foregoing passage since the previous source citation. This must be a matter of judgement, and the answer can never be certain. This issue is dealt with in the commentary on all the fragments that fall into this category (e.g. *Annales Maximi* F1–3, Cincius 2 F6, etc.).

To conclude: our view is that the *OGR* is a work of fourth-century date, and one which is very much in the tradition of the Virgilian commentaries. Whilst it is weak in many respects, and error-strewn, it is neither a parody nor a collection of inventions. Works that are either parodies or forgeries, or are in other ways mischievous, do exist, but a comparison seems to show that the *OGR* is flawed but not fiction, most of the flaws arising from abridgement and second- or third-hand quotation of texts that the author has not himself seen. Peter excluded the citations on the grounds that the work was a forgery; that view is now discredited, and we have included them, notwithstanding the fact that many challenges remain. Misattribution and perhaps misremembered authors cause us problems as editors, because it is hard to tell where the error lies, but once this is accepted, the *OGR* becomes an extremely important citing authority. Its focus on early history, and interest in divergent interpretations, enriches our knowledge both of traditions surrounding early Rome, and of the range of potential interpretations. Whilst it has to be used with great care, the rehabilitation of the *Origo* marks one of the distinctive differences between modern editions and that of Peter.

Peter's reasoning is set out most fully in 'Die Schrift Origo gentis Romanae', *BSGW* 64 (1912), 71–166; the defence was led by A. Momigliano, 'Some observations on the "Origo Gentis Romanae"', *JRS* 48 (1958), 56–73 (=*Secondo contributo*, 145–76), and was taken up in the editions of G. Puccioni, [Aureli Victoris] *Origo Gentis Romanae* (Florence, 1958), and J.-C. Richard, *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor, Les origines du peuple romaine* (Paris, 1983). Important contributions include G. Puccioni, 'La tradizione annalistica nell'*origo gentis romanae*', *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 221–98; P. L. Schmidt, '(Aurelius) Victor II: Origo gentis Romanae', *RE* suppl. 15 (1978), 1583–1634; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 41–8. For a recent edition with German translation

and notes see M. Sehlmeyer, *Die Ursprünge des römischen Volkes* (Darmstadt, 2004). There is no up-to-date, reliable, or authoritative English translation, but older versions and some amateur efforts can be found on the Internet: these should be used with caution. Although Momigliano proved that the work is not a medieval or Renaissance forgery, it does not follow that all the citations are authentic, as some have supposed. Momigliano himself was cautious and non-committal on this issue. See now C. J. Smith, 'The *Origo Gentis Romanae*: facts and fictions', *BICS* 48 (2005), 97–136 with references, and Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 328–34.

On the transmission of the text see Momigliano, 58–60, and R. J. Tarrant, M. D. Reeve, in *Texts and Transmission*, 149–53.

(CJS/TJC)

Orosius

Orosius arrived in Africa from Spain as a young presbyter in AD 414, and then visited Jerome in Bethlehem on Augustine's recommendation. Returning to Africa, he compiled, with Augustine's encouragement, his *Histories against the Pagans* (*Historiae aduersum paganos*), in seven books, covering the period from the Creation to AD 417. The work begins as a universal history, but the last four books, from the Pyrrhic War on, focus just on Rome and its empire. The work was designed to offer a Christian response to the pagan argument that the coming of Christianity had brought disaster, and Orosius sought to achieve this chiefly by portraying pagan history as a long series of calamities.

Orosius used a very limited number of sources, and for Roman republican history his material derives wholly from Livy. As with Eutropius and the Livian *periochae*, it is disputed whether Orosius used Livy directly or via an epitome (see on Livy, I. 83 n. 88).

Orosius' preoccupation with cataloguing misfortune led him to reproduce a good deal of material from Livy on army strengths and battle casualties (whether suffered or inflicted by the Romans). Livy had a particular tendency to note his sources' variants on such points, and in seven passages Orosius echoes Livian citations of the fragmentary historians, corresponding to one fragment of Fabius (F21b), four of Quadrigarius (F63, 70, 71, 88), three of Antias (F36, 65, 66b), and one of Galba (F2). One of these passages (4.20.6) corresponds to an extant Livian passage (33.10.7–10=Quadrigarius F63, Antias F36). The other six derive from books of Livy which are lost to us, and so are valuable both for the fragments themselves and as evidence of Livy's source usage in the lost books. In two of these cases Livy's information is also reproduced in other sources (*periochae*, Eutropius). At 5.3.3 Orosius confusedly makes Valerius Antias into two separate writers.

At 4.20.7–9 Orosius comments that the sources' variation on casualty figures originated in patriotic fraud and associates it with generals' tendency to minimize their own losses and exaggerate those of the enemy, and he repeats the observation at 5.3.4. At 7.10.4 he notes that Sallust and Tacitus (in passages now lost) declined to give figures for enemy casualties.

Orosius' work is translated with introduction and commentary by A. T. Fear (Translated Texts for Historians 54, Liverpool, 2010).

(JWR)

Paulus Diaconus (Paul the Deacon)=Paul. Fest. *See* Festus.

Pliny the Elder

For information about the life, career, and historical works of C. Plinius Secundus (AD 23/4–79) see the introduction to Pliny (80). For the present purpose we are concerned solely with his surviving work, the *Natural History*, one of the most remarkable productions from antiquity, and arguably one of the most influential. This work, in thirty-seven books, is dedicated to the emperor Titus and was completed in AD 77 (*praef.* 3), although its composition would have taken several years, and it included the results of a lifetime of inquiry and scholarly research. Its subject is an encyclopedic study of the natural world, starting with a description of the world as a whole (book 2), its geographical regions (3–6), and its constituent elements, in hierarchical order, starting with the human race (7), then moving on to other land animals (8), fish (9), birds (10), insects (11), plants (12–25), drugs obtained from plants and animals (26–32), and finally minerals (33–7). In his preface (17) he claims to have read 2,000 volumes and gathered 20,000 facts from 100 authors (the latter two figures are considerable underestimates).

With over eighty references to fragmentary Roman historians, Pliny the Elder is one of the most important citing authorities we have. As a source of citations the *Natural History* is unusual, if not unique, in a number of ways. First, Pliny frequently and regularly names his sources as he goes along. Second, he prefaced each book with a detailed summary of its contents, together with a list of authorities consulted, both Roman and foreign (the latter, of course, mostly Greek); in the text as we now have it these prefaces have been lumped together in sequence and placed at the start of the work to form book 1. The authors in question are writers of all kinds – poets, philosophers, historians, orators, antiquarians, and specialist writers on all manner of subjects – and dating from all periods. Third, we are fortunate to have a detailed account of his methods of work and composition in a letter of his nephew, Pliny the Younger (*epist.* 3.5, partially quoted at 80 T1). The letter, addressed to Baebius Macer, lists the elder Pliny's published works, and then proceeds to describe his habits of reading, excerpting, note-taking, and composition. These processes, which also involved the use of assistants, resulted in a collection of annotated excerpts which grew in size during the last years of Pliny's life; when his nephew inherited them after his death in 79 they numbered 160 volumes (Plin. *epist.* 3.5.17).

The precise nature of the various stages of research and composition is not entirely clear and has been much discussed; but his nephew's letter indicates that Pliny and his assistants worked directly with texts read at first hand, and is enough to refute the more extreme theories associated with nineteenth-century *Quellenkritik*. These theories maintained that Pliny was a faceless compiler who took most of his references at second hand from intermediary sources that had done the work of compilation for him. The most important and lasting of these studies is that of Münzer, who sought to demonstrate that Pliny had in fact culled much from Varro. Münzer's detailed analysis has much to commend it: Varro was undoubtedly used extensively by Pliny, and Münzer did not insist that he had never read any of the original sources. But he

did argue that much of the work of data collection had been done already by Varro, and that Pliny merely reproduced Varro's results.

Münzer's position seems reductive, however; the assumption that Pliny did not go back beyond Varro seems unjustified. He disagrees with Varro (see 13.84–9—one of Pliny's most extravagant displays of learning) and follows other sources, and even though he must have used and to some extent relied on Varro, there is no reason to believe that he had not also read Varro's sources. Moreover Pliny cites many sources that were written later than Varro, without any obvious sign that he is doing anything different. If he was merely recycling Varro's learning, and adding additional material from his own reading of subsequent literature, one would expect this procedure to be more obvious in his text.

In the course of the *Natural History* Pliny cites almost all the major Roman historians, from Fabius Pictor to his own day. He is one of the few sources to cite historians of the imperial period; without him our knowledge of the works of Messalla Rufus, Agrippa, Fenestella, Cremutius Cordus, the emperor Claudius, Agrippina, Corbulo, and Suetonius Paullinus would be even sparser than it is. Of the major republican annalists Claudius Quadrigarius is the only one not to be mentioned at all; Licinius Macer is listed frequently in the indexes of book 1 (see Macer 27 T4), but the only actual citations, at 32.9 and 14 (=Macer 27 F29–30), seem to be mistaken references to Aemilius Macer (see comm. ad loc.), and there must be some doubt about whether Pliny ever consulted the historian Licinius Macer. He also seems not to have made use of writers of contemporary history, and makes no reference anywhere to Fannius, Asellio, Rutilius Rufus, Sisenna, or Sallust; Asinius Pollio is listed among the sources for book 7, but is not cited in the text.

The historians Pliny cites most often are L. Piso (fourteen fragments), Cato (ten), Fenestella (eight), Antias (six), the emperor Claudius (six), Cn. Gellius (five), Cassius Hemina (four), and Coelius (three). Fabius Pictor, Messalla Rufus, Agrippa, Augustus, Cremutius Cordus, and Domitius Corbulo are each cited twice, while Tuditanus, Sulla, Tubero, Oppius, Agrippina, and Suetonius Paullinus have one citation each. Perhaps surprisingly, Livy is also cited just once (at 3.132). On the other hand, Livy is listed three times in book 1, among the sources for books 2, 3, and 7; as will be apparent from what has already been said, this is not the only example of an author listed in book 1 who is absent from the relevant later book. The correspondences between the bibliographical lists and the citations in the text are only partial. To take the example of book 16, of the twenty-two sources listed in book 1 only thirteen are actually cited in the text. Conversely, some of the authors cited in the text do not appear in the relevant bibliographical list in book 1. Some of the Roman historians who are cited in the text are not listed anywhere in book 1: they include Tuditanus, Coelius, Sulla, and Agrippa. By contrast, Cincius, Atticus, Ateius Philologus, Pollio, Galba, and Arruntius are listed in the bibliographies in book 1 but are not cited anywhere in the text.

The conclusion to draw from this evidence is probably that Pliny did not always cite the sources he used, and that his memory and his referencing system were not efficient enough to ensure that all his citations were represented in his bibliography (*plus ça change*!). That is hardly surprising, given the conditions in which he had to work, and should not be taken as evidence that he did not read the works he listed or

that he cited them only at second hand, although that may be the explanation in some cases.

Modern scholarship on Pliny the Elder reveals an author who is more subtle than was sometimes thought, and one who has been able to impose his own creative structure and thematic unity on what is admittedly a compilation of material from a wide variety of sources. Scholars such as Mary Beagon and Valérie Naas have reinstated the *Natural History* as a work held together by the author's distinctive personal voice, by its unifying theme of 'man in nature', and by the moral and philosophical ideas typical of a Roman of Pliny's class and background in the Flavian era. One of the principal implications of this revisionist picture is that the work of compilation was shaped by Pliny's own ideas, outlook, and conscious artistry, and that these interests determined his choice of sources, in contrast to the old-fashioned view that he was following the predetermined selection of earlier compilers.

A notable example is the extensive use he made of the historian L. Calpurnius Piso, the most frequently cited annalist by some distance. The explanation must be that Pliny found Piso's work especially valuable as a source of examples to support the moral points that he (Pliny) wished to make. He found Piso's moralizing congenial, useful, and authoritative, backed up by his status as a consul and censor, and his reputation for integrity, all of which served to make him a *grauis auctor* (2.140; 17.244=Piso 9 T6). This example reinforces the conclusion that Pliny had read his Roman historians with care, and that when dealing with historical material he chose the sources that best suited his own purposes.

The overwhelming majority of Pliny's citations of Roman historians are indirect references to information found in their works; on only four occasions does he quote their actual words. These verbatim quotations include one each from Messalla Rufus (42 F2) and Augustus (60 F1), and two from Cassius Hemina (6 F17 and 35). The indirect citations are either in reported speech using the accusative and infinitive construction, often dependent on the formula *X auctor est*, or, much less frequently, passages in direct speech accompanied by phrases such as *ut tradit X*. These methods of citation inevitably raise questions about how much of the information in question is being attributed to the named author—an issue treated in the commentaries on individual fragments. There is always a strong chance that Pliny took more from his historical sources than the particular passages he acknowledges explicitly (see further e.g. the commentary on Cato 5 F53–60); his text also contains many anonymous fragments—that is, passages attributed to nameless *auctores*, or to *annales* (i.e. historical works).

For the most part Pliny cites his sources simply by name. Only rarely does he add the title of the work, sometimes in a casual or offhand way: he refers to Cato's *Origines* as *annales* at 8.11 (5 F115) and to Piso's *Annals* as *commentarii* at 13.87 (9 F14). Curiously, both his citations of Fabius Pictor add the words *in annalibus suis* 10.71; 14.89=Fabius 1 F20 and 25). Book numbers are also given very rarely. The first book of Piso's *Annals* is cited twice for the evoking of thunderbolts by Numa and Tullus Hostilius (2.140; 28.14=Piso 9 F12, 15a–b); apart from this, Pliny supplies book numbers in only one passage, the discussion in 13.84–8 of the books of Numa, where he cites book 4 of Cassius Hemina's *annales* (6 F35), book 1 of Piso's *commentarii* (9 F14), book 13 of Tuditanus (10 F3), and books 2 and 3 of Antias (25 F9a and 58). The

unique character of this passage stands out, and may well signify that the pattern of citation in this case is taken from the source he has chosen to criticize, namely Varro.

For the text, preserved in a very complex manuscript tradition, see L. D. Reynolds in *Texts and Transmission*, 307–16; M. D. Reeve, 'The editing of Pliny's "Natural History"', *RHT* NS 2 (2007), 107–79. Although the edition we use is the Teubner of Jan–Mayhoff, the Budé volumes are based, in varying degrees, on independent collation, not on the conversion of Jan–Mayhoff's negative apparatus. In particular, Ernout, the founder of the Pliny series, was provided by Cardinal Tisserant with photographs of Vat. Lat. 3861 (D), for whose readings (together with those of Par. Lat. 6795 in books 7–11) Jan–Mayhoff had been dependent on the sporadic citations of Detlefsen, and these photographs remained available to subsequent Budé editors. As is usual for the series, the Budé editions are very sparing in their citation of conjectures.

F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (Berlin, 1897) remains an extremely valuable work. Modern studies of Pliny include M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford, 1992; see also her *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal* (Oxford, 2005), a translation of book 7 with commentary); V. Naas, *Le Projet encyclopédique de Pline l'Ancien* (Rome, 2002); ch. 3 (107–36, a revised version of an article in *RPh* 70 (1996) 305–32) deals with Pliny's research methods. On this see also A. Locher, 'The structure of Pliny the Elder's Natural History', in R. French, F. Greenaway (eds.), *Science in the Early Roman Empire* (London, 1986), 20–9. For the views expressed here see C. J. Smith, 'Pliny the Elder and Archaic Rome', in E. Bispham, G. Rowe, E. Matthews (eds.), *Vita Vigilia Est: Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick* (London, 2007), 147–70 with further references.

(CJS/TJC)

Plutarch

Plutarch was born, probably around AD 45, at Chaeronea in Boeotia, where he lived for most of his life, although he travelled widely in Greece and Asia Minor; we know also that he went at least once to Egypt, and visited Rome and Italy many times. His family was well-to-do and Plutarch was able to move in the highest circles; among his Roman friends and acquaintances he was able to count the consulars T. Avidius Quietus, Q. Arulenus Rusticus, and L. Mestrius Florus. It was from Florus that Plutarch (L. Mestrius Plutarchus) obtained the Roman citizenship. The *Parallel Lives* (which were written in Plutarch's mature years, between 96 and his death around 120) were dedicated to another leading figure, Q. Sosius Senecio, consul in 99 and 107, a friend of the emperor Trajan, and son-in-law of Frontinus (q.v.). Most of what we know about Plutarch (including the above) comes from scattered references in his own works, and it is actually quite difficult to reconstruct a detailed biography or to place his writings in chronological order of composition or publication.[120]

Of Plutarch's many and various works it is the *Parallel Lives*, and in particular the lives of the Roman heroes in each pairing, that are most relevant to the present discussion, although some of his philosophical essays concern Roman history

[120] For reconstruction of Plutarch's biography see C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), and, on the chronology of his works, *JRS* 56 (1966), 61–74; for reservations about the dating of the Roman lives see Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 7–10, with n. 56.

and antiquities (especially the *De fortuna Romanorum* (*mor.* 316C–326C) and the *Quaestiones Romanae* (*mor.* 263E–291C), which between them account for four of our fragments: Cato 5 F137; Fenestella 70 F6; Cluvius Rufus 84 F1; Antias 25 F20); and the lives of Galba and Otho, the only ones to survive from Plutarch's *Lives of the Caesars*, are important in the debate about the sources for the Year of the Four Emperors (see introduction to Cluvius Rufus (84) for discussion of this issue. Cluvius is quoted at *Otho* 3.2=84 F4).

The most plausible reconstruction of Plutarch's working method in the Roman lives is that he began by reading widely around the subject, making such notes as he considered necessary and selecting the most appropriate narrative source to follow for each part (and sometimes for the whole) of the life, and then composed a preliminary draft shaped around the main narrative source, supplementing it as he went along with material drawn from other sources, from his own general knowledge, and from oral tradition—that is, stories he picked up in conversation with his well-to-do Roman friends.[121] It is noticeable that most of Plutarch's references to named sources are linked to these supplementary items, rather than to the main historical narrative, where the chosen source is only rarely acknowledged by name.

Although Plutarch's principal narrative sources are cited only infrequently, and sometimes not at all, they can often be positively identified or conjectured with some degree of probability. As one might expect, these principal sources sometimes included Greek historians of Rome, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus (the main, perhaps the only, source for *Coriolanus*[122]) and Polybius (the main source for parts of *Aemilius Paulus* and *Flamininus*[123]); but it is important to note that Plutarch was equally if not more reliant on historical works written in Latin, a language he knew well enough for this purpose—even if, as he himself admits (*Dem.* 2), he was unable to appreciate finer points of style or to read Latin literature for pleasure.[124] His research for the Roman lives included wide reading of the Roman historians, and enabled him to use such authors as Sallust, Livy, and Asinius Pollio as his main narrative sources. Livy is more frequently cited than any other Roman historian except Sulla, whose memoirs are quoted sixteen times in the course of his life, and is named no fewer than fifteen times in all;[125] he may have been one of Plutarch's main narrative sources for *Camillus*, *Fabius Maximus*, *Marcellus*, *Flamininus*, and *Aemilius Paulus*, although this is difficult to prove in any particular case, given that similarities between Plutarch and Livy could also indicate their use of the same source or Plutarch's use of

[121] On Plutarch's working methods and sources see above all Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 1–44, updated in his edition of Plutarch, *Caesar* (Oxford, 2011), 36–58; see further I. 110–12.

[122] As argued by Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 7–8; Mommsen, *RF* 2, 117–18 n. 4; D. Russell, *JRS* 53 (1963), 21–9.

[123] Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 80–1, 86–9; C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 95–8; J. Geiger in B. Scardigli (ed.), *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford, 1995), 170–7; G. Zecchini in A. Pérez Jiménez, F. Titchener (eds.), *Historical and Biographical Values of Plutarch's Works: Studies . . . P. A. Stadter* (Malaga, 2005), 513–22.

[124] On Plutarch's knowledge of Latin and use of Latin sources see H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford, 1924), 11–19; C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 81–7; knowledge of Latin literature: Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 2.

[125] Livy is cited by name in the following passages of the *Lives*: *Cam.* 6.2; *Marc.* 11.8; 24.5; 30.5; *Comp. Pel. Marc.* 1.8; *Flam.* 18.9; 20.10; *Cat.Mai.* 17.5; *Luc.* 28.8; 31.9; *Sull.* 6.19; *Caes.* 47.3–6; 63.9, and at *mor.* 269c and 326a.

an intermediary dependent on Livy;[126] but his influence is less evident in *Publicola* (see below, and n. 132), and is even harder to assess in lives that fell in the period after 167 BC, when the surviving text of Livy runs out. As for Sallust, he is cited in *Lucullus* (11.6; 33.3) and *Comp. Lys. Sull.* (3.3), may well have influenced early chapters of *Pompey*, and is almost certainly the main source of *Sertorius*.[127]

For the period from 60 BC to the battle of Philippi Plutarch probably made extensive use of the work of Asinius Pollio, particularly in *Pompey*, *Crassus*, *Caesar*, *Cato Minor*, *Brutus*, and *Antony*.[128] The many similarities between Plutarch and other sources dealing with this period, particularly Appian, but also some passages of Dio and Suetonius, is often explained by supposing that the shared material derives ultimately from Pollio.[129] In general terms this is likely to be correct, but the matter is complicated, first by the possibility that in some passages Appian may be using Plutarch (see I. 46), and second because Plutarch may not have read Pollio directly, but rather a secondary historical account based on him. Many names have been suggested as possible intermediaries, including Timagenes, Strabo, and Fenestella,[130] and the list could be extended (e.g. Clodius Licinus (64), Cremutius Cordus (71), and Seneca (74), to name three who covered the period in question, not to speak of little-known figures such as Furnius (50) or Galba (57), the scope of whose works is unknown). Although there is no reason to prefer this hypothesis (i.e. that Plutarch knew Pollio only at second hand), it cannot be ruled out;[131] and it remains hazardous to infer the character of Pollio's work from passages in Plutarch and Appian that share a common source, when it is not absolutely certain that the source in question is Pollio rather than a work dependent on Pollio (see I. 439–40).

Other Roman historians that Plutarch may have used as main sources can only be conjectured. Valerius Antias is a serious possibility: Plutarch probably consulted him directly in *Flamininus* (see commentary on Antias 25 F55, 56, 71), and perhaps used him as a main source in *Publicola*, especially in passages which cannot be based on either Livy or Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and which represent a tradition favourable to Publicola.[132] Whether he used other annalists such as Cn. Gellius, Licinius Macer,

[126] The possibilities are discussed by Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 17–28, 51–7, 74–89; B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs* (Munich, 1979), 32–42, 52–60; and NB Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 234–5 n. 113, and in M. Griffin, J. Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata* 1 (Oxford, 1989), 203 and n. 7.

[127] Pompey: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 112–14; Sertorius: ibid. 61–5; R. Flacelière, *Plutarque, Vies* 8 (Paris, 1973), 6–7; B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs* (Munich, 1979), 98–103; C. F. Konrad, *Plutarch, Sertorius* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1994), liii; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 16.

[128] Pelling (*Plutarch and History*, 2–14) has demonstrated that these six lives were composed relatively late, and were prepared together as a single project. *Cicero* and *Lucullus* were written earlier, and are not as well informed; Pelling's argument that at that stage Plutarch did not yet have access to Pollio is extremely attractive. The fact that the new material begins in the years 60–59 BC is rightly taken as a sign that it must derive, directly or indirectly, from Pollio, whose main narrative began then (see I. 438).

[129] For references see I. 439–40, n. 64.

[130] Timagenes: A. Klotz, *Mnemosyne* 6 (1038), 313–19; Timagenes and Fenestella: G. Delvaux, *LEC* 56 (1988), 44–8; 57 (1989), 127–46; Strabo: P. Otto, *Quaestiones Strabonianae* (*LSKPh* 11 Suppl., 1889), 285–8.

[131] Thus Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 12–24, where he speaks of 'the Pollio-source', although he has now abandoned this cautious formula (*Plutarch, Caesar*, 45).

[132] Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 45–51; Münzer, *De gente Valeria*, 9–14; H. Volkmann, *RE* 8 A1, 181–2, 186–7; M. Affortunati, B. Scardigli in P. A. Stadter (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London, 1992), 109–31.

or Claudius Quadrigarius we cannot know, but he never refers to any of them by name. Of the earlier historians Fabius Pictor is acknowledged as a source for the legend of the birth and upbringing of Romulus and Remus (*Rom.* 3.1; 8.9=Fabius 1 F4b), as he is in the parallel account of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.75.4–83.3= Fabius 1 F4a). The relationship between these two texts is extremely complex; the most probable reconstruction is that both Plutarch and Dionysius had read Fabius Pictor for themselves, but if so neither reproduced Fabius closely and both included additional material taken from other sources (see commentary on Fabius 1 F4). Whether Plutarch used Fabius as a main source in the rest of *Romulus* is much less certain (but he is cited by name again at 14.1). Other early historians include Acilius and Piso, who are cited once each (*Rom.* 21.9; *Numa* 21.7 respectively). As for Cato, his works are cited frequently in his life, including speeches and the *De agri cultura*, but whether they included the *Origines* is not proven (see commentary on Cato 5 F135–6), and there is no sign that Plutarch used Cato's *Origines* as a source in any of his other Roman lives.

The example of Cato shows that Plutarch made use of his subjects' own writings, where they were available, and he did so in many of the late republican lives: he cites speeches by Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus,[133] as well as the latter's work about his brother's career (11 F2). Sulla's memoirs clearly lie behind much of his life, as well as parts of *Marius* (see introduction to Sulla (22)), while Cicero's work 'On his Consulship' undoubtedly informed Plutarch's various accounts of the Catilinarian conspiracy.[134] Plutarch actually cites Cicero more than any other Roman author, and uses material from his letters, speeches, and treatises not only in his life but also in lives dedicated to other contemporary figures; in particular, the first part of *Antony* is based on the *Second Philippic*.[135] Caesar's *De bello Gallico* must be the ultimate source of Plutarch's narrative of the Gallic War (*Caes.* 18–27), albeit probably at second hand.[136] He also refers, perhaps indirectly, to Antony's response to the *Philippics* (*Cic.* 41.6), and to several passages of Caesar's *Anticato*.[137] On the other hand, although he makes considerable use of Brutus' correspondence, he does not cite private letters of Caesar or Antony, although they were available.[138] Equally, he seems not to have read their speeches, or those of Crassus and the younger Cato, although he knew of their existence and could have obtained access to at least some of them.[139]

Many of Plutarch's quotations provide intimate and unusual glimpses into the lives and character of his subjects, and out-of-the way stories that were not to be found in the mainline historical tradition. Above all, he seems to have been anxious to cite the first-hand testimony of eyewitnesses to key episodes and the personal reminiscences of close friends and others who knew the subjects personally. The late republican lives are a rich source of such material, contributing many of the fragments in this

[133] Speeches: *Ti.* 9.5; 15.2–16.1 (Tiberius); 22.3; 23.9; 24.2; 24.4; 29.2; 25.5-6 (Gaius).

[134] Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 45–63, and see I. 373.

[135] Pelling, *Plutarch, Antony*, 26–7, 33–4.

[136] Pelling suggests that the intermediary was Pollio (*Plutarch, Caesar*, 43, 47–8) or 'the Pollio-source' (*Plutarch and History*, 95 and n. 15).

[137] Pelling, *Plutarch, Caesar*, 48, and comm. on 3.4 and 54.5–6, and cf. I. 359.

[138] Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 15 and n. 93; 17 and n. 110.

[139] Ibid. 17 and n. 109.

collection. Plutarch cites the autobiographical memoirs of Catulus (19 F1–3), Rutilius Rufus (21 F10, 14), and Augustus (60 F5, 6, 7a–b, 13, 16), and provides an invaluable record of personal recollections of his subjects by their acquaintances—of Tiberius Gracchus by C. Fannius (12 F4), of Pompey by Theophanes (*FGrHist* 188 F1) and Oppius (40 F5), of Cicero by Tiro (46 F2), of Caesar by Oppius (40 F7), of Cato by Munatius Rufus (37 F2–3), of Brutus by Bibulus (49 F1), Messalla Corvinus (61 F1–3), and Volumnius (47 F1–2), and of Antony by Dellius (53 F2–3). Dellius is also the most likely source for Plutarch's account of Antony's eastern campaigns (*Ant.* 37–51: cf. I. 424 and comm. on 53 F1), and it is a worthwhile speculation that the detailed and sympathetic account of Crassus' Parthian adventure (*Crass.* 18–31) derives from Licinius Apollonius (see I. 355).

In the Roman lives Plutarch's citations of historical sources are very unevenly distributed. Whereas first-hand evidence, in the form of letters, public documents, speeches, and personal memoirs, was available in abundance for the late republican lives, such documentation was largely or entirely lacking for the lives of earlier Romans. In particular the early and middle republican lives, namely *Publicola*, *Coriolanus*, *Camillus*, *Fabius Maximus*, *Marcellus*, *Flamininus*, and *Aemilius Paullus*, contain very few citations from named sources. In these lives Plutarch does his best with a limited amount of material: in *Aemilius Paullus* he refers several times (15.5; 18.4; 21.7) to a letter of Scipio Nasica which described his part in the campaign of Pydna (*FGrHist* 233 F1–3; see I. Appendix 1, A16). But this is an exceptional case, and for the most part in these lives Plutarch has to rely exclusively on secondary historical sources, although he is sometimes able to compensate by drawing on primary Greek material, particularly in *Flamininus* (9.2–3; 12.6–7; 16.3–4) and *Aemilius Paullus* (19.4; 20.3; 21.3=Posidonius *FGrHist* 169 F1–3). In a notable passage of the *Camillus* (22.2–3) Plutarch observes that the Gallic capture of Rome was reported by Greek authors, specifically Heraclides Ponticus and Aristotle. But such exceptional instances only serve to confirm the general point that in these lives Plutarch relied almost exclusively on secondary historical accounts, which he mostly chose not to acknowledge by name.

Matters are somewhat different, however, in the lives of the two earliest Roman heroes, Romulus and Numa. This is something of a paradox, since both belong mostly if not entirely to the world of myth, and contemporary source material was not (and could not have been) available to Plutarch or any other writer. Plutarch was certainly aware that the stories of Theseus and Romulus did not quite belong to history,[140] and his approach to them raises important philosophical questions; but for the present purpose what is important is the nature of the information that he had at his disposal. The legendary origins of the city attracted a great deal of attention on the part of historians and antiquarians, and gave rise to endless speculation in the search for historical explanations and aetiologies. For writers of the early empire the available

[140] In the preface to the Theseus–Romulus pair Plutarch likens his task to that of an explorer entering uncharted territory, and asks his readers to be indulgent in suspending their disbelief (*Thes.* 1). For an important discussion of the issue see Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 171–93. At 189 n. 1 Pelling points out that the case of Numa is slightly different, and that for Plutarch Romulus belongs to myth rather than history, but that Numa is just on the historical side of the line.

information included a vast and bewildering array of material, and created the need to report and to discriminate between competing versions of the supposed events. Consequently, in *Romulus*, and to a lesser extent in *Numa*, Plutarch is able to cite a great number of variant traditions, often anonymously (notably in the list of obscure and eccentric versions of the foundation story in *Rom.* 1–2), but also by name: he refers to the antiquarians Varro (*Rom.* 12.3–4; 16.6) and Juba (*Rom.* 14.7; 17.2; *Num.* 7.10; 13.9), and to obscure Greek authors such as Promathion (*Rom.* 2.8), Zenodotus of Troezen (*Rom.* 14.8), and Antigonus (*Rom.* 17.5). These two lives between them provide eight fragments of Roman historians, namely Fabius Pictor (1 F4b, F7), Acilius (7 F1), Piso (9 F13), Paulus Clodius (16 F1), Valerius Antias (25 F5, F9b), and Galba (57 F1). The contrast with the lives of Romans of the early and middle republic, which contain hardly any source citations, is evident. The same pattern is found also in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. I. 62), and more generally in the evidence as a whole, as the distribution of fragments in this edition demonstrates.

An important question that arises not only from these examples but from a broader consideration of Plutarch's source references in general is whether he had read the cited works for himself or whether he worked at second hand and copied the references from intermediary sources. There can be no single answer for all Plutarch's citations. It would be difficult to argue, and impossible to prove, that every citation comes from first-hand consultation of the work(s) in question; and indeed, Plutarch himself often acknowledges that he is quoting at second hand.[141] On the other hand, many years have passed since scholars assumed, as a matter of course, that all his citations were indirect, and simply copied from intermediaries who had done his work for him. This was a characteristic attitude of early twentieth-century scholarship, which tended to deny originality to extant authors in favour of their lost sources and models, even when there was no evidence that such lost predecessors had even existed. In particular, it was claimed that Plutarch relied on earlier biographies which had shaped his material and provided all his source references.[142] But these entirely hypothetical biographies are ghostly shadows; there is no positive evidence for their existence,[143] and the case depends on the idea that Plutarch simply could not have read all the works he cites, and the additional claim that they would not in any case have been available to him in backward Chaeronea.

The difficulty of obtaining books is mentioned by Plutarch himself (*Dem.* 2.1–2), but in a passage where he also indicates ways of getting around it, namely by visiting large cities (including Rome), where books are easily available and information can be

[141] His three citations of Catulus (19 F1–3) are attributed not directly to Catulus, but to unspecified authors who report (ἱστοροῦσι, λέγουσι) his statements (see further I. 273). His knowledge of the work of Munatius Rufus (37) was partly, if not wholly, based on the later work of Thrasea Paetus (81): see I. 358–9 and I. 536. Other examples include Galba 57 F1 (from Juba), and references in the Greek lives to authors cited by Hermippus: e.g. Pataecus (*Sol.* 6.7); Euanthes (*Sol.* 11.2); Ctesibius (*Dem.* 5.7); Pappus (*Dem.* 30.1). See C. Theander, *Plutarch und die Geschichte* (Lund, 1951), 54, 61–2.

[142] Strong statements to this effect in E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* 2 (Halle, 1899), 1–87, esp. 62, 67, 69; Leo, *Gr.-röm. Biographie*, 161–75, 178–92; W. Uxkull-Gyllenband, *Plutarch und die griechische Biographie* (Stuttgart, 1927), 103–12; R. E. Smith, *CQ* 34 (1940), 1–10; M. Gelzer, *Gnomon* 36 (1964), 658–62.

[143] Convincingly demonstrated by Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, supported by C. J. Tuplin, *SLLRH* 10 (2000), 124–61.

obtained from learned acquaintances. It is likely that on his travels Plutarch did what he could to obtain books, to borrow them from friends, and to consult them in libraries, where he was able to make notes. When composing his own works at home he would have relied on these notes, and on his well-trained memory, as much as—if not more than—on books that were open in front of him. He would also have had assistance from others, including slaves and freedmen as well as friends, not only in obtaining books but also in reading and excerpting them on his behalf. The example of the elder Pliny (see I. 102) suggests that reading and note-taking could have been carried out by scribes and research assistants, some of them bilingual.[144] If so, we might concede that his knowledge of the works in question was, strictly speaking, indirect, but it would no longer be necessary to invoke imaginary lost biographies or compilations[145] as intermediary sources.

Recent scholarship has reacted against the sceptics, and it is now widely accepted that Plutarch's lives are original works based on wide reading of multiple sources. Today no one doubts that Plutarch was a man of immense learning and culture, who read voraciously in both Greek and Latin, and whose works were artfully constructed in order to express his own ideas and values. Even in cases (which seem to be the exception rather than the rule) where he used just one source, as in *Coriolanus*, it is clear that he adapted and developed the material from his source in ways that intensified the drama of the story and enhanced its psychological depth.[146] In other lives he reshaped different kinds of material from multifarious sources. Some modern scholars believe that he had read for himself all the works he cites,[147] but most nowadays incline to a middle position, recognizing that Plutarch's reading was extensive and first-hand, but admitting that some references may have come to him indirectly, whether from intermediary sources or through friends or assistants.[148] First-hand knowledge of major histories and memoirs is likely, and of important contemporary writings such as Cicero's *Second Philippic* or the Letters of Brutus.[149] Negative statements—such as the observation that a given work makes no reference to something or other—clearly also imply that Plutarch has read the work for himself (e.g. Cicero's work on his consulship: 39 T5, and Tiro's biography of Cicero: 46 T1). Naturally

[144] On the use of assistants see C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 81–7; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 24.

[145] The idea that Plutarch took his citations from a '*variorum* compilation' was suggested for *Alexander* in a characteristically extreme and dogmatic article by J. Enoch Powell, *JHS* 59 (1939), 229–40.

[146] Thus Russell, *JRS* 53 (1963), 21–8; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 309–11, 326–7, 387–411.

[147] Except when he explicitly acknowledges an intermediary (see n. 141). This is the view taken by A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford, 1945), 54–84; C. Theander, *Plutarch und die Geschichte* (Lund, 1951); P. A. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965); J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1969), xliii–lxii; it is also consistently applied in the editions of Plutarch's *Lives* in the Budé series, edited by R. Flacelière.

[148] This is the line taken by Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, *passim*, whom we have largely followed. A similar position is adopted by Ziegler in his fundamental entry in *RE* 21.1 (1951), 636–962, who distinguishes (at 911–13) between works Plutarch had certainly read, those he probably read, and those he knew only at second hand. Roman sources are listed at 926–8. No one today believes in the regular and systematic use of intermediary sources, although a relic of the old view can be found in articles by G. Delvaux, *LEC* 56 (1988), 27–48; *LEC* 57 (1989), 127–46; *AC* 65 (1996), 107–17; but these are based on a thesis presented in 1945 (see *LEC* 56 (1988), 48 n. 99; Ziegler, *RE* 21.1, 913).

[149] *Second Philippic*: Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 17; id., *Plutarch, Antony*, 26–7, 33–4. Letters of Brutus: Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 37–8, n. 93.

some passing references, especially when two or more authors are cited together, may be second-hand; but in a great many cases it must be admitted that we simply cannot be sure one way or the other. Nevertheless, the positive assessment of Plutarch's working methods that most modern scholarship implies (and is broadly accepted here) would tend to favour first-hand knowledge.

One consequence of this interpretation is that at the ultimate stage of composition Plutarch must have relied heavily on his memory, which seems to have been excellent, and on notes from works that had been read earlier, perhaps even years earlier.[150] Sometimes his memory let him down: this at least seems to be the best explanation of the minor errors that occur in the *Lives*. For instance, the curious fact that Coriolanus' wife and mother are named Virgilia and Volumnia respectively, rather than Volumnia and Veturia as in Dionysius, and that the Volscian leader Attius Tullius is named Aufidius, is best explained as a lapse of memory. The same applies to his account, taken from Livy, of the conversation between Hannibal and his cavalry commander after Cannae, where Plutarch (*Fab.* 17.2) calls the officer 'Barcas'—evidently a made-up name—having forgotten (and failed to note down) that his name was Maharbal (Livy 22.51).[151]

The possibility of minor errors of this kind needs to be borne in mind, but in general Plutarch can be regarded as a trustworthy authority in the preservation of fragments. Although he frequently quotes Greek sources verbatim,[152] almost all of the citations of Roman historians included as fragments in this edition are in reported speech, the only partial exceptions being the line of Euripides quoted by Brutus and recorded by Volumnius (47 F2) and the Homeric verses recited in a conversation, again involving Brutus, reported by Bibulus (49 F1). Most of Plutarch's citations of Roman historians are introduced simply by the author's name, but in certain cases he also identifies the work, as he does for Gaius Gracchus (11 F2), Paulus Clodius (16 F1), Rutilius Rufus (21 F10), Cicero (39 T5, F1), and Bibulus (49 T1). He names the work more systematically when citing the memoirs of Sulla (22 F4, 6, 11, 14a-b, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26) and Augustus (60 F5, 6, 7a–b), and in the case of Sulla 22 F4 and F6 he (quite exceptionally) gives the book number.

In general Plutarch deserves a positive assessment as a citing authority. He is genuinely learned, well-read, honest about his learning, and broadly reliable. He names his sources relatively frequently, and is particularly valuable as a source of primary evidence recorded by contemporary witnesses. He provides the only evidence for four of our historians: C. Piso (28), Munatius Rufus (37), Volumnius (47), and Bibulus (49). Plutarch is a major citing authority, and one of the best sources we have.

Major commentaries include H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford, 1924); P. A. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965: on the *Mulierum uirtutes=mor.* 242E–263C). Lives: *Alexander*, J. R. Hamilton (Oxford,

[150] On Plutarch's use of memory and notes see Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 20–2, 65–90, 118–19.

[151] Other examples include *Gr.* 21.7, where he makes Gaius Gracchus and Fulvius Flaccus (rather than C. Papirius Carbo) put Scipio on the spot with a question about the murder of Tiberius Gracchus, or *Caes.* 66.4, where he makes D. Brutus Albinus delay Mark Antony at the door of the senate, rather than Trebonius, as he correctly writes at *Brut.* 17.2. At *Them.* 12.8 he confuses Tenedos with Tenos (Hdt. 8.82).

[152] Examples in C. Theander, *Plutarch und die Geschichte* (Lund, 1951), 42.

1969); *Antony*, C. B. R. Pelling (Cambridge, 1988); *Aristides and Cato*, D. Sansone (Warminster, 1989); *Brutus*, J. L. Moles (unpublished DPhil. thesis, Oxford, 1979); *Caesar*, C. B. R. Pelling (Oxford, 2011); *Cicero*, J. L. Moles (Warminster, 1988); *Sertorius*, C. F. Konrad (Chapel Hill, NC, 1994). Editions of the *Parallel Lives* with extensive scholarly introductions and notes are also being produced, by R. Flacelière and others in the 'Budé' series (Collection des Universités de France) (Paris, 1957 onwards), by M. Manfredini and others: *Plutarco. Le vite*, in the 'Fondazione Lorenzo Valla' series (Milan, 1977 onwards), and by various authors: *Plutarco. Vite parallele*, in the Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli series (Milan, 1987 onwards). Note that each of the Rizzoli volumes contains the essay 'La tradizione manoscritta delle Vite', by M. Manfredini (1987).

On the sources of Plutarch's Roman lives and other issues dealt with here see Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*; A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford, 1945), 54–84; K. Ziegler, 'Plutarchos (2)', *RE* 21.1 (1951), 636–962; C. Theander, *Plutarch und die Geschichte* (Lund, 1951); W. C. Helmbold, E. N. O'Neill, *Plutarch's Quotations* (Baltimore, 1959); C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971); D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London, 1973); A. E. Wardman, *Plutarch's Lives* (London, 1974); B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs* (Munich, 1979); J. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography* (Stuttgart, 1985), 58–62; P. A. Stadter (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London, 1992); T. E. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford, 1999); Pelling, *Plutarch and History*.

(TJC)

Polybius

Polybius of Megalopolis (*c.*200–118 BC) was the son of Lycortas, a leading figure in the Achaean League, and himself held the League's second most important office, the hipparchy, in 169/8. In 167 he was among the thousand Achaeans deported to Rome on suspicion of disloyalty during the recent war with King Perseus of Macedon. During his exile he enjoyed the friendship of Scipio Aemilianus and other prominent Romans and began work on his history. The deportees were allowed to return to Achaea in 150, but Polybius accompanied Scipio at his siege of Carthage in 147–146 and undertook other later travels. In 146 he assisted in the Roman settlement of Greece after the Achaean War.

Polybius' minor works are all lost. His *Histories* comprised a forty-book history of the world for the period 264–146 BC, from the outbreak of Rome's first war with Carthage to the destruction of Carthage and Corinth. The first five books, covering the period down to 216, survive intact, the remainder in extensive excerpts. Polybius wrote as an exponent of 'pragmatic' (that is, political) history, and produced a work of remarkable range and historical penetration, whose central theme is the Romans' conquest of the world.

Polybius' frequent references to earlier historians are almost always scathingly critical. However, in the earlier part of his work he must have been mainly dependent on his predecessors for his source material, and he evidently made extensive use of at least one of the fragmentary Roman historians, namely Fabius Pictor.[153] For the First

[153] On Polybius' use of the fragmentary Roman historians see esp. Walbank, *Comm.* 1. 28–9.

Punic War, Polybius' reference to Fabius and Philinus of Acragas as the two historians 'who are reputed to write about it from the closest acquaintance' (1.14.1 = Fabius 1 T5) indicates that they were his principal sources on the war, but it is seldom possible to determine which of the two he was following at any particular point. Polybius will also have made extensive use of Fabius for events between the first two Punic Wars, in particular the Illyrian campaigns and the Gallic wars, and Fabius must have been his source for the celebrated overview of Italian manpower (2.24; cf. Fabius 1 F21, with comm.). He will have continued to use Fabius for the Second Punic War, until Fabius' account terminated. Polybius tells us that Fabius' history was marred throughout by partiality for the Roman side, as was Philinus' by pro-Carthaginian sympathies ((1.14.1–3, 15.12 = Fabius 1 T5). He expresses disagreement with Fabius' assessment of the contestants at Eryx in the closing phase of the First Punic War (1.58.5 = Fabius 1 F19), and is strongly critical of Fabius' view of the relationship of Hasdrubal and Hannibal to the Carthaginian home government (3.8.1–9.5 = Fabius 1 T6, F25).

Polybius may have made some use of the Roman writers who wrote histories in Greek in succession to Fabius, such as Cincius Alimentus (2) and Scipio, son of Africanus (3). However, the only one of these writers whom he mentions is A. Postumius Albinus (4), and all his references to him are unfavourable. Postumius had presided as *praetor urbanus* in 155 when the senate decided against releasing the Achaean deportees (33.1.3–8 = Postumius 4 T2). Polybius blamed Postumius' handling of the meeting for this outcome, and this may account for his subsequent hostility. He criticizes Postumius' character, accuses him of avoiding participating in a battle in the Achaean War out of cowardice and then claiming the credit, and reports with relish Cato's scornful comment on Postumius' choosing to write his history in Greek, but then apologizing for the shortcomings of his Greek in his preface (39.1 = Postumius 4 T3a, F1). In view of these strictures, it is perhaps unlikely that Polybius used Postumius' history as a source.

By the end of his time as a deportee in Rome, Polybius had come to be on good terms with Cato (35.6.3–4; see further intro. to Cato, I. 195). Whether he made any use of the *Origines* is unknown.

Walbank, *Comm.*, remains invaluable for all matters Polybian. Important studies of the *Histories* include: F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1972); A. M. Eckstein, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1995); C. B. Champion, *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 2004); B. C. McGing, *Polybius' Histories* (Oxford, 2010).

(JWR)

Priscian

Priscianus (no other names are attested), the greatest of the grammarians of late antiquity, originated from Caesarea in Mauretania and taught at Constantinople in the early sixth century AD. His grammatical works (he also composed a panegyric on Anastasius and Latin versions of the *Periegesis* of Dionysius and the *Progymnasmata* of Hermogenes) occupy almost two whole volumes of *Grammatici Latini*. The most important of these works is the eighteen books of the *Institutiones*, which became the principal authority for the teaching of grammar and Latin in medieval Europe.

The first sixteen books provide a very detailed treatment of the eight parts of speech; the final two books deal with syntax. Priscian's other grammatical works include *De figuris numerorum*, *De metris fabularum Terenti*, *Institutio de nomine et pronomine et uerbo* (a compendium of the *Institutiones*), and *Partitiones xii uersuum Aeneidos principalium*, a word-for-word analysis of the opening twelve lines of the *Aeneid*.

The *Institutiones* contain seventy-six citations of our historians, probably all drawn from earlier grammarians. These citations relate to sixty-five distinct fragments: six fragments are cited twice, Macer 27 F7 three times and Coelius 15 F35 four times. There are three citations in the *Partitiones*, but two of these are to fragments also cited in the *Institutiones*. All Priscian's citations are verbatim, and fifty-eight attribute book numbers. His citations of our authors are spread across his Books 3–13; most concern noun, verb, and pronoun forms. Eighteen of our authors are cited, with Cato and Coelius particularly well represented (twenty-six and fourteen citations respectively).

Comparison of Priscian's citations with an extant text provides a salutary lesson. He cites eleven passages from Livy books 37–40, giving seven book numbers, five of which are wrong. Book numbers are notoriously liable to corruption, but it is somewhat unlikely that copyists are at fault on every occasion. The citation differs from the MSS of Livy in eight of the eleven passages: in six it is clear that Priscian is in error; at 37.54.19 the omission of *et conditoribus* could be the result of a scribe's eye moving from one *-s* to another, while at 40.5.9 Priscian's *Perseum* could be correct against *Persea* in the MSS of Livy.

There are more MSS of Priscian than of any other Latin prose work apart from the Bible (for a list see M. Passalacqua, *I codici di Prisciano* (Rome, 1978)). Hertz's edition of the *Institutiones* has a negative apparatus based on fifteen manuscripts, and inferences drawn from it are particularly hazardous.

See Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 346–8.

(JB/JWR)

Probus

Various texts were wrongly attributed in late antiquity to the great Flavian grammarian M. Valerius Probus, including grammatical treatises and a commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Two of our fragments are cited from the Virgil commentary (with book numbers). A fragment of Sisenna (26 F136d) is cited in the *De nomine excerpta*. All three citations purport to be verbatim (though that of Sisenna leaves unclear the case of *pater*).

See H. D. Jocelyn, *CQ* 35 (1985), 468–9; Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 348–50. For the text of the *De nomine* see also M. Passalacqua, *Tre testi grammaticali bobbiesi* (Rome, 1984).

(JB/JWR)

Quintilian

Marcus Fabius Quintilianus was born at Calagurris in northern Spain around AD 35. He received his education in Rome, and returned there in 68 with the emperor Galba, who until his accession had been governor of Tarraconensis. Under Vespasian, Quintilian was appointed official teacher of Latin rhetoric with a salary of 100,000

sesterces (Suet. *Vesp.* 18); according to Jerome he was the first holder of such a post. During a tenure of twenty years (*inst.* 1 *pr.* 1) he taught the younger Pliny (*epist.* 2.14.10) and the two nephews of Domitian (*inst.* 4 *pr.* 2), obtaining great wealth and an honorary consulship (Iuv. *sat.* 7.186, 197; Auson. *grat. act.* 31: *ornamenta consularia*). In his retirement he wrote his great work on rhetorical education, the *Institutio oratoria*, his only surviving work, assuming that he is not, in fact, the author of two collections of declamations that have come down under his name (see *OCD*[4] s.v. *declamationes pseudo-Quintilianeae*). It was presumably published before the death of Domitian, who is addressed in flattering terms in 10.1.91; Quintilian himself probably died around the same time as the emperor (96), or soon after.

The twelve books of the *Institutio oratoria* give a full and systematic account of the education and training of an orator from earliest childhood. They are filled with illustrative quotations from Greek and Latin poets, philosophers, and orators—but the Roman orators are notably concentrated in the period from the age of Cicero onwards.[154] As one might expect, quotations are especially common in books 8–9, dealing with style. Quintilian cites historians very rarely, and it is noteworthy that the few verbatim quotations of unusual phrases used by historians are all taken at second hand: Fabius Pictor 1 F4d is from Varro, Sisenna 26 F114b from Caecilius, and Labienus 62 F2 from Pollio. On the other hand, he undoubtedly knew his historians, and greatly admired Sallust and Livy; and in the first chapter of book 10 (recommended reading for orators) he devotes several sections to history, and is the source of a number of our testimonia. At 10.1.31–4 he discusses the value of history for the orator, both for style and as a source of historical facts and examples. Greek historians are assessed at 10.1.73–5; the two masters, Herodotus and Thucydides, naturally have pride of place, but room is also found for Xenophon, Theopompus, Philistus, Ephorus, and Clitarchus. Hellenistic historians are ignored, with the single exception of Timagenes, who is surprisingly praised for reviving historiography after a long period of neglect. So much for the likes of Hieronymus, Timaeus, Phylarchus, Polybius, Posidonius, and Strabo!

Roman historiography is treated at 10.1.101–4, starting with Sallust and Livy (their predecessors are ignored), who are famously compared to Thucydides and Herodotus respectively. Quintilian then proceeds to deal with Livy's successors, namely Servilius Nonianus, Aufidius Bassus, Cremutius Cordus, and an unnamed contemporary who receives lavish praise, and whom we, along with most others, have tentatively identified as Fabius Rusticus (see I. 569). In view of its general importance this unique passage is reproduced in full as a General Testimonium (GT5, II. 8–9).

There is an excellent Loeb edition of the *Institutio oratoria* by D. A. Russell (5 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 2002). In general on Quintilian see G. A. Kennedy, *Quintilian* (New York, 1969); M. Winterbottom in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Empire and Aftermath* (London, 1975), 79–97; M. L. Clarke, ibid. 98–118; and standard histories of Latin

[154] Cato, Gaius Gracchus, M. Antonius, and L. Crassus are rarely cited, and when they are the references tend to derive at second hand from Cicero, e.g. at 2.17.5 (Antonius) and 9.4.101 (Crassus). At 2.5.19–26 Quintilian advises teachers not to allow boys to acquire a taste for archaism so that they sound like Cato or the Gracchi; equally they should not be excessively seduced by the facile attractions of contemporary rhetoric. His advice is to recommend Cicero and authors who most closely resemble him.

literature. On the text see M. Winterbottom, *Problems in Quintilian* (London, 1970); *CQ* 17 (1967), 339–69; and his entry in *Texts and Transmission*, 332–4.

(TJC)

Scholia

Scholia (the word is attested only in Greek, and first in Cicero) are commentaries on ancient texts. They are frequently written around the text rather than in manuscripts of their own. Although we have not included them under the present heading, the Servian commentaries on Virgil are also scholia, and the two Virgil scholia listed below have more in common with them than with those on Juvenal and Lucan (they were published by Hagen in the *Appendix Seruiana*).

(JB)

Scholia: Juvenal

The scholia on Juvenal comprise (i) the *scholia uetustiora*, material from a commentary written in the late fourth century; (ii) material composed in the Carolingian period; (iii) comments attributed, wrongly, to Probus by Valla in the edition of Juvenal published at Venice in 1486. They preserve two of our fragments, neither verbatim or with book number, Pompeius Planta 94 F1, with different versions in the *scholia uetustiora* and Valla, and Marius Maximus 101 F1.

See P. Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem uetustiora* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1931), preface; R. J. Tarrant in *Texts and Transmission* 202, esp. n. 15.

(JB)

Scholia: Lucan

The scholia on Lucan consist of the *Commenta Bernensia*, preserved in Berne, Burgerbibliothek 370, and published by H. Usener, *M. Annaei Lucani commenta Bernensia* (Leipzig, 1869), and the *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, preserved in the same Berne MS and, more fully, Geneva–Cologny, Bodmer 182, and published by J. Endt, *Adnotationes super Lucanum* (Leipzig, 1909). The former is the source of all three fragments (the citations are verbatim) of Cornutus (54 F1–3).

(JB)

Scholia: Virgil, *Bernensia*

The *scholia Bernensia*, which cite two of our fragments, are so called because three of the most important manuscripts are in the Swiss capital (Berne, Burgerbibliothek 165, 167, 172; the fourth is Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. F. 79). They contain glosses on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, related to the *Explanatio in bucolica* attributed to Junius Philargyrius (Hagen, *Appendix Seruiana* (Leipzig, 1902), 1–189) and the *Breuis expositio Vergilii georgicorum* (ibid. 193–320). For detailed discussion and bibliography see B. Daintree and M. Geymonat in *EV* 4, 711–20.

(JB/JWR)

Scholia: Virgil, *Veronensia*

These scholia cite six of our fragments, two verbatim and two with book numbers; five occur in the scholia on the *Aeneid*, and one on the *Georgics*. The scholia, written

in rustic capitals in the fifth century, are preserved in fragmentary form in Verona, Biblioteca capitolare xl (38), a palimpsest in which the upper text contains the sermons of St Gregory, the lower, in addition to the scholia, fragments of Livy books 3–6 (see Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 158), the *Elements* of Euclid, and a philosophical treatise. For futher details see Lowe, *CLA* 4, nos. 498–501.

The text was first published by Angelo Mai in 1818, and was re-edited by H. Keil (Halle, 1848) and A. Herrmann (Donaueschingen, 1868/9–1869/70); Mai and Herrmann were allowed to use chemical reagents to make the text more legible, which caused irreversible damage to the manuscript. In 1902 Hagen published, in *Appendix Seruiana*, 393–450, what naturally became the standard edition. In 2001 and 2003, however, Aldo Lunelli, using modern technology, published a new edition of the scholia on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* (*Maia*, 53 (2001), 63–131; 55 (2003), 5–83). Unfortunately, those on the *Aeneid* have not yet appeared. In view of Lunelli's comments (2001, 64), we felt we could not safely use C. Baschera, *Gli scolii veronesi a Virgilio* (Verona, 1999).

(JB/JWR)

Seneca the Elder

L. Annaeus Seneca ('the Elder'), born of equestrian family at Corduba in Baetica, lived from *c.* 50 BC to *c.* AD 40. On his life and on his historical work on the period from the Civil Wars see Seneca (74).

Towards the end of his life Seneca wrote a work on declamation, in which he collected epigrams and *colores* (i.e. lines of approach) used by eminent declaimers on a variety of themes. The work was addressed to his three sons, and entitled *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae diuisiones colores*. In its original form the work comprised ten books, each with a preface, on *controversiae* (i.e. declamatory exercises designed to train for courtroom speaking, and based on legal cases) and two books on *suasoriae* (i.e. exercises designed as training for speaking in public meetings). Five books of the *controversiae* and one of the *suasoriae* are preserved more or less in full, and an abridgement of the remaining books of the *controversiae* also survives.

Incidental remarks in the *controversiae*, particularly in the prefaces, give us much information on the literary culture of the early empire, and yield several testimonia for fragmentary historians who were also declaimers. The themes of the *controversiae* mainly relate to imaginary cases, but a few are taken from Roman history, as with 9.2, based on the story of L. Flamininus' having an execution carried out to gratify a lover, where Seneca's version of the incident agrees with that given by Valerius Antias, whom he perhaps followed (see comm. on Antias 25 F55). Roman history also provides the themes for *contr.* 3.9, 4.2, 7.2.

In a digression in the first *suasoria* Seneca cites Messalla Corvinus' nickname *desultor* ('the vaulter') for Q. Dellius, the serial traitor of the Civil Wars (*suas.* 1.7 = Messalla Corvinus 61 F6, Dellius 53 T2). The themes of the first five surviving *suasoriae* are taken from Greek mythology or history, but those of *suas.* 6–7 relate (like *contr.* 7.2) to the death of Cicero. In *suas.* 6.14–25 Seneca digresses to discuss historians' treatment of the death of Cicero and their obituary judgements on him, citing verbatim from the versions of Livy and the following fragmentary historians: Aufidius Bassus (78 F1), Cremutius Cordus (71 F1), Bruttedius Niger (72 F1),

and Asinius Pollio (56 F7). This multiple citation is of crucial importance for our knowledge of the fragmentary historians dealing with the Civil War period, and provides our chief evidence for their language and style.

There is an excellent Loeb edition of the elder Seneca's surviving writings by M. Winterbottom (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1974). See also L. A. Sussman, *The Elder Seneca* (Leiden, 1978); J. A. Fairweather, *The Elder Seneca* (Cambridge, 1981); M. T. Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 1–19.

(BML/JWR)

Seneca the Younger

L. Annaeus Seneca ('the Younger'), second son of the writer on declamation, lived from near the end of the first century BC until he was ordered by Nero to commit suicide in AD 65. Dramatist, politician, philosopher, and statesman, he was the author of (among other things) twelve ethical treatises and 124 *epistulae morales*. So he had a twofold reason for citing historians of all periods in his prose works for the exempla they provided; but some of the stories were too well known to require quotation from any particular author, or for it to matter what the source was—historical accuracy was not what was being sought—and we have only four named citations, at once so few and so various as to defy classification, except that Seneca's interests are in literary style and moral conduct.

The only citation from the treatises is one of several stories showing ways in which slaves might benefit their masters: *benef.* 3.23.2 (Quadrigarius 24 F82), on an episode of the siege of Grumentum during the Social War.

In the *epist.* so informal in tone and cavalier is Seneca over his references that he professes to be uncertain whether it is the historian Messalla Corvinus or the Augustan poet and expert on rhetoric Valgius who is the source of the notion that Mt Etna is 'unicum': *epist.* 51.1 (Messalla Corvinus 61 F5). Then, in 108.30–1 (Fenestella 70 F8), when he is insisting on the diversity of interests that engages specialists in a given passage, Seneca notes the item that will attract a philologist: the fact that there was appeal to the people (*provocatio*) even under the kings. He mentions in passing that this is also the opinion of Fenestella, among others. The historian is casually enlisted to strengthen the subsidiary point that Seneca is making. More purposefully, when he is writing on style as a mirror of character, Seneca brings on Sallust and his arch-imitator Arruntius to deride the peculiarity of Arruntius' Latin with repeated quotations (114.17–19=Arruntius 58 F1–7). But the writer is only coincidentally a historian: Seneca, preoccupied with verbal usage in the first and third of these passages, passes here from literary style to dandyism (Maecenas) and moral failings.

See M. T. Griffin, *Seneca, a Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford, 1976); and see I. Appendix 1, A1 for reasons for not including Seneca as a historian in this edition.

(BML)

Servius

Maurus (or Marius) Servius Honoratus was a grammarian who taught at Rome and author of various extant treatises, of which the most important (and the only one to preserve any of our fragments) is his commentary on Virgil. Servius is portrayed as a participant in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, in which he is said to have only recently begun

to teach (1.2.15); since the dialogue is set in the early 380s (see above on Macrobius, I. 89), this implies that he must have been born no later than, but perhaps not long before, 360.

The Virgil commentary exists in two versions, with different manuscript traditions. The shorter version is that of Servius himself. The longer version was first published by Pierre Daniel in the 1600 Paris edition of Virgil, and is conventionally known as Servius Danielis (or alternatively Scholia Danielis or Servius Auctus). This version reproduces most of Servius' commentary, but also incorporates extensive additional material, and in this form must have been the work of a later compiler. We use the generally accepted symbols S for the shorter version and DS for the longer version.

We have presented Servian material, in both text and translation, in the following way (our method is an adaptation of that used in the Harvard edition). We give first the line(s) of Virgil which are the subject of comment, accompanied by the symbol '(V)'. This is then followed either by the full Servian comment or, if this is too long for full citation, by the portion containing the citation with which we are concerned. If a comment or portion of a comment is given in both versions, or in only one version, it is printed across the full width of the page, prefaced by either '(DS+S)', '(DS)', or '(S)', as appropriate. When the versions of DS and S differ significantly, we print them, or those parts of them which differ, in parallel columns, with DS on the left and S on the right. Sometimes, however, the differences between the two versions are very slight, and in that case we indicate the differences in brackets within the common material printed full width.

The shorter S version, composed by Servius himself, appears to have been designed for school use: most of the notes consist of explication of language suitable for schoolboys, and the treatment of mythological and historical topics is often perfunctory. Servius' principal source is generally held to have been the earlier commentary by Aelius Donatus (on whom see above, I. 64). The additional material in the DS version is often of a more advanced character, with wider and more precise source citation, particularly from older writers. Much of this material too is likely to have been taken from Donatus' commentary, but scholars dispute how far (if at all) the compiler may have drawn on other sources as well.

The divergence between the two versions' practice is particularly marked in the case of their citation of the fragmentary historical writers, tabulated in Table 7. The S version cites just four of our authors: Cato is cited twenty times, Sisenna three times, Hyginus seven times, and the limited choice of Varro's works included in our collection twice (Varro's other writings are also extensively cited). Most of these citations relate to the legend of the Trojans in Italy or to Italian cities (Servius is our only source for Varro's work on Trojan families and, along with Macrobius, for Hyginus' work on that theme and on Italian cities). Some of these writers are referred to several times for the same point: thus ten of the Cato citations in fact relate to just three of our fragments (Cato 5 F4, 6, 7) and the two Varro citations both relate to the Palladium (Varro 52 F3). However, only two of the citations are verbatim, and only one includes a book number (Cato 5 F34a=*Aen.* 11.700).

The added material in the DS version yields a further eighteen citations of Cato, two from Hyginus, and one from the included works of Varro. However, it also includes citations from thirteen other historians writing under the republic, a further three

Table 7. Citation distribution in Servius and Servius Danielis

	DS+S	DS	S	*total*
Fabius (1)		3 (1)		3 (1)
Cincius (2)		1		1
Postumius (4)		1		1
Cato (5)	19 (1)	18 (5)	1	38 (6)
Hemina (6)		6 (2)		6 (2)
Fabius Servilianus (8)		1 (1)		1 (1)
Piso (9)		2		2
Cn. Gellius (14)		3		3
Coelius (15)		7 (4)		7 (4)
Scaurus (18)		1 (1)		1 (1)
Asellio (20)		1 (1)		1 (1)
Quadrigarius (24)		3 (2)		3 (2)
Sisenna (26)	3 (1)			3 (1)
Lutatius (32)		2		2
Tubero (38)		2 (1)		2 (1)
Ateius Philologus (51)		1		1
Varro (52)	2	1		3
Agrippa (59)		1		1
Augustus (60)		2		2
Hyginus (63)	6	2	1	9
Rubellius Blandus (108)		1		1
total	30 (2)	59 (18)	2	91 (20)

Note: verbatim citations in brackets

later historical writers (Ateius Philologus, Agrippa, and Augustus), and from Rubellius Blandus, of unknown date and known only from this citation. These citations are deployed to elucidate a wide variety of often recondite topics in language, etymology, antiquities, etc., and sometimes several of these citations are deployed to illustrate the same point. Eighteen of the citations are verbatim and nine carry book numbers.

Both Servius himself and the compiler of the DS version are unlikely to have had any direct knowledge of the fragmentary historians and will have taken their citations of these writers from earlier Virgilian commentators, principally Donatus. Even Donatus himself probably drew most or all of his citations of the fragmentary historians from earlier commentators such as the early third-century Aemilius Asper (cf. Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 410–1). However, Servius, simplifying for his school readership, dispensed with the references to the less-known historical writers which he found in Donatus. For the operation of this process of simplifying omission see, for example, *Aen.* 2.15, where both versions cite Hyginus for the wooden horse, but the fuller account in the DS version also cites Tubero, or *Aen.* 12.603, where both versions mention an account of Amata's death different from Virgil's, but the S version attributes it just to 'others' (*alii*), while the DS version credits it to Fabius Pictor (1 F2) and then adds further material with a citation from Cassius Hemina (6 F19).

We have used the Harvard edition of Servius for *Aen.* 1–5 (1946, 1965). This edition has not progressed beyond that point, and so for the remainder we use the edition of G. Thilo (1883, 1887). The deficiencies of the Harvard edition were pointed out by E. Fraenkel in a review of the edition of *Aen.* 1–2 (*JRS* 38 (1948), 131–43; 39 (1949), 145–54); little account appears to have been taken of his criticisms in that of *Aen.* 3–5 (cf. e.g. S. Mariotti, *RFIC* 94 (1966), 127). In general on Servius and on the two versions of his commentary see P. K. Marshall in *Texts and Transmission*, 385–8; G. Brugnoli, *EV* 4. 805–13; Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 169–97, 356–9; Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 240 ff., 408 ff., 567 ff. On the citation of the fragmentary historians (and other early writers) in the S and DS versions see also R. B. Lloyd, *HSCPh* 65 (1961), 291–341, and C. Sensal, in G. Abbamonte, F. C. Bizzarro, L. Spina (eds.), *L'ultima parola: l'analisi dei testi: teorie e pratiche nell'antichità greca e latina* (Naples, 2004), 325–35.

(JB/JWR)

Solinus

C. Julius Solinus is known as the author of a work entitled *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, which circulated widely in the Middle Ages and survives in numerous manuscripts (over 250 are known).[155] The work dates from the third or fourth century AD: Mommsen dated it to the period of Valerian and Gallienus, but others have placed it as early as the Severan period or as late as the reign of Constantius II.[156] The work is a description of the world in fifty-six chapters, starting with Rome (1), then moving on to Italy (2), the western Mediterranean islands (3–6), Greece (7–11), the Hellespont and Pontus, Thrace, and Scythia (12–19), northern and western Europe (20–3), Africa (24–32), Arabia and Syria (33–7), Asia Minor (38–45), Assyria, India, and the Parthian empire (46–56). It concentrates on wonders and curiosities, describing human inhabitants, animals, trees, minerals, etc. Much of it is based on Pliny, with additional material from Pomponius Mela (though neither is acknowledged by name) and other unidentified sources. The compilation may have been the work of Solinus himself, or of an intermediary whom Solinus followed, as Mommsen thought, postulating a second-century epitome.

Mommsen grouped the surviving manuscripts into three classes, the first two of which represent slightly different versions of what he considered Solinus' authentic text. The third class contains additions and modifications, as well as a second dedication letter (giving it the new title *Polyhistor*), and purports to be a revised edition by Solinus—or, rather, the authorized edition, the earlier one having been issued without the author's consent. Mommsen regarded it as an early medieval revision (early

[155] M. E. Milham, *Scriptorium* 37 (1983), 126–9.

[156] The dedicatee, one Adventus, has been identified with M. Oclatinius Adventus, the consul of AD 218: H. Usener, *RhM* 22 (1867), 446; Schanz–Hosius 3^3, 226. On the other hand, P. L. Schmidt argues for a fourth-century date, specifically under Constantius II (*Philologus* 139 (1995), 32–3). K. Brodersen (*BICS* 54 (2011), 66–7) sees merit in Mommsen's arguments against a later date (e.g. the fact that Solinus speaks of Byzantium, not Constantinople), and opts for the late third century; while Bedon returns to the Severan period and a dedication to the consul of 218 (R. Bedon in M. Clavel-Lévêque, E. Hermon (eds.), *Espaces intégrés et ressources naturelles* (Besançon, 2004), 59–60. A firm *terminus ante quem* of the end of the fourth century is provided by the fact that Solinus is quoted by Ammianus, Servius, and Augustine.

seventh century?), and the second dedication as a forgery. This view has been challenged by Walter, who argues that the second dedication is genuine, and that the revised and enlarged version is the work of Solinus. However that may be (and Walter succeeded in showing that Mommsen's theory was neither necessary nor probable), the one historical fragment preserved only in the second edition (Nepos 45 F6) can still be taken as a genuine citation, as Mommsen himself admitted (see comm. ad loc.).

All the other citations of lost historians occur in the first two chapters, dealing with Rome and Italy, and in sections where Solinus is dependent not on Pliny but an unknown supplementary source (indicated by 'IGN' in the margins of Mommsen's edition). These supplementary additions are more frequent in chapters 1 and 2 than in the rest of the work, which is almost entirely summarized from Pliny and Mela. In particular, the first forty-seven sections of chapter 1 are taken from well-informed antiquarian sources and deal with the foundation legend and Roman chronology down to Caesar's reform of the calendar. The underlying source of most of this material is likely to be Varro,[157] but some sections must come from a post-Varronian source. These sections, especially 1.27–44, share common features with Censorinus (20–2) and Macrobius (1.12), and may derive from the same source, variously identified as Suetonius' *Prata* (or, if it is not part of that work, the *De anno Romanorum*) or a chronographic work by Cornelius Bocchus (as Mommsen supposed: on Bocchus see I. Appendix 1, A13). Other possibilities include L. Cincius (on whom see introduction to Cincius Alimentus (2)), Verrius Flaccus (see I. Appendix 1, A39), and Cornelius Labeo, a third-century antiquarian.[158] All the historians cited by Solinus, no doubt at second hand, belong to the republican period. Note that the citations of Licinius Macer at 2.12 (Macer 27 F33) and Cn. Gellius at 2.28 (Gellius 14 F18) depend on textual emendations and are classified as doubtful in the former case and uncertain in the latter.

Mommsen's edition (Berlin, 1864; second edn., 1895) remains fundamental, although his theory of an early medieval revision should be rejected in the light of H. Walter, *Die 'Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium' des C. Iulius Solinus* (Wiesbaden, 1969). On the text see R. H. Rouse in *Texts and Transmission*, 391–3. A new edition for the Budé series is appearently being prepared by R. Bedon: see his papers in *Espaces intégrés et ressources naturelles*, ed. M. Clavel-Lévêque, E. Hermon (Besançon, 2004), 59–73; and in *Naissance de la science dans l'Italie antique et moderne*, ed. L. De Poli, Y. Lehmann (Berne, 2004), 71–92. Other recent work on Solinus includes H. Walter, *C&M* 24 (1963), 86–157; P. L. Schmidt, *Philologus* 139 (1995), 23–35; K. Brodersen, *BICS* 54 (2011), 63–88 (the latter arguing that Solinus was an innovative writer on geography).

(TJC)

[157] See, in addition to Mommsen, the valuable contribution of H. A. Sanders, *AJPh* 23 (1902), 28–45, esp. 42–4.

[158] On whom see P. Mastandrea, *Un neoplatonico latino: Cornelio Labeone* (Leiden, 1979); Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 616–18.

Stephanus of Byzantium

See introduction to Asinius Quadratus 102, I. 615 n. 13.

Strabo

Born in *c.*64 BC at Amaseia in Pontus, into a leading Pontic family at the time of Pompey's eastern conquests, Strabo studied in a number of places, including Rome. Posidonius, whom he met as a young man, may have influenced Strabo's intellectual development, particularly in the interrelationship between his historical and geographical works. The former is lost; the latter, in seventeen books, surveys the known world in the Augustan period, although it is not always clear whether Strabo's information relates to his own day, or to that of his many older (and now lost) sources. His aim was to give a detailed description of a very Roman world for a mixed audience of Greeks and Romans whose concerns are imagined to be administrative and political, and to give the Augustan world a unified geographical setting; in this he is the heir of Polybius and Posidonius. He has significant things to say on all areas of the empire, but it is the perspective on the Augustan world of the educated provincial with contacts right at the centre of power which is really striking. He died early in the reign of Tiberius, perhaps in AD 21.

More than 500 Greek historical fragments (in the widest sense) are cited in Strabo's text, from more than ninety historians.[159] Two of these are Roman historians who wrote in Greek: Fabius (Pictor?) and Acilius (if the text is correctly emended here: see commentary on Acilius 7 F7; on the identity of Fabius see commentary on Fabius 1 F24). Whether the three other Roman historians cited by Strabo, Tanusius Geminus (44), Dellius (53), and Pollio (56), wrote in Greek or Latin is uncertain.[160] Jacoby believed that Dellius wrote in Greek and included him in *FGrHist* (no. 197), but this seems unlikely to us (see introduction to Dellius and comm. on 53 F2). In the case of Tanusius (not in Jacoby) there seems to be no way of deciding; on the other hand, the view that Pollio wrote in Greek is highly improbable (see introduction to no. 56). Fabius and Acilius are cited in the course of historical digressions in Strabo's account of Italy (Fabius 1 F24 on the Sabines and Acilius 7 F7 on the Evander legend). The other fragments are more obviously geographical: Pollio (56 F2) is cited in the description of the Alps for the length of the Rhine (Strabo disagrees); Dellius (53 F1) is cited as an authority for the distance from the Araxes to the Median fortress of Vera, and may be the source of Strabo's other references to Mark Antony's campaigns (see comm. ad loc.); while Tanusius (44 F1), if that is the correct reading of the name, is cited for marvels in Mauretania.

In all these citations Strabo follows his usual practice, which is to cite prose writers in indirect speech (as opposed to poets, who are frequently quoted verbatim) and without giving book numbers.

S. Radt's edition of Strabo's *Geographika*, with German translation and full commentary, is now complete (10 vols., Göttingen, 2002–11). On Strabo see also

[159] Figures from P. Bonnechère, *Indexes of Jacoby*, *FGrHist* vol I (Leiden, Brill, 1999).

[160] There is also some uncertainty about the names of Tanusius and Dellius, which have been corrupted in transmission, but can be restored with reasonable confidence (see commentary on Tanusius 44 F1 and Dellius 53 F1).

K. J. Clarke, *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford, 1999); D. Dueck, *Strabo: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London, 2000); D. Dueck, H. Lindsay, S. Pothecary (eds.), *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia* (Cambridge, 2005).

(EHB/TJC)

Suetonius

The life and career of C. Suetonius Tranquillus can be sketched in broad outline, although precise details are few and far between. His family, which was of equestrian standing, may have originated at Pisaurum in Umbria (Syme, *Tacitus*, 780–1), but the discovery of an inscription in his honour at Hippo Regius in Numidia alerted scholars to the possibility that he may have been born there (*AE* 1953, 73, with details of his official career). He grew up under the Flavians, and his statement that he was *adulescens* in 88 (*Nero* 57.2) would suggest a date of birth in the late 60s or early 70s. He was a correspondent of the younger Pliny, whose patronage gave him preferment in the imperial administration (*epist.* 3.8.1) and other benefits (1.24; 10.94–5), as well as literary encouragement (5.10); and he may have accompanied Pliny to Bithynia *c.*110–12 (Syme, *Tacitus*, 779). He subsequently went on to serve the emperor as a secretary, holding the posts of *a studiis*, *a bibliothecis*, and finally *ab epistulis*. This last appointment ended dramatically in (probably) 122, when Hadrian dismissed him, together with the praetorian prefect Septicius Clarus and many others, for what the *Historia Augusta* calls overfamiliarity towards the empress Sabina (*HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 11.2). That is the last we hear of Suetonius; the date of his death is unknown.

Suetonius was a prolific author who wrote on all manner of subjects. The *Suda* (T 895 s.v. *Τράγκυλλος*) gives a long list of titles of now-lost works: *On Greek Games*, *On Roman Spectacles*, *On the Roman Year*, *On Signs in Books*, *On Cicero's Republic*, *On the Names and Types of Clothes*, *On Insults*, *On Rome, its Customs and Manners*. Other sources mention miscellaneous collections entitled *Prata* or *De uariis rebus*, as well as works *On Kings* and *On Famous Whores*. These last two seem to belong in the category of biographical works, along with the extant *De uita Caesarum* and the partially extant *De uiris illustribus*. The *Lives of the Caesars*, in eight books, contains the famous biographies of the twelve Caesars, from Julius Caesar to Domitian. The *De uiris illustribus* originally comprised more than one hundred lives of literary figures, distributed into four or five books, each devoted to poets, orators, historians, philosophers, and teachers of grammar and rhetoric. Only the last of these, the *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, survives in a direct tradition, and then only in part: twenty teachers of grammar are followed by only five of the sixteen rhetoricians listed in the index at the start of the work. The remaining *rhetores* were already missing from the now lost *codex Hersfeldensis*, a ninth-century manuscript (also containing the minor works of Tacitus) from which all surviving witnesses are derived. The other books are known partly through the indirect testimony of Jerome, who drew on them for entries in his version of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (see above, under 'Hieronymus'), and partly from the lives of individual writers that have been preserved separately with manuscript copies of their works; the lives of the poets Terence, Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Persius, and Lucan, the historian Pliny the Elder, and the orator Passienus Crispus are all believed, with greater or lesser degrees of probability, to be derived from Suetonius.

The wide-ranging scope of this collection of short biographies inevitably recalls earlier Roman authors of literary biography such as Varro, Nepos, and Hyginus; and Jerome, in the preface to his own collection of lives of Christian writers, bracketed them (and the little-known Santra) together with Suetonius as the models he had chosen to follow (see Nepos 45 T19). Like his renowned predecessors, Suetonius adopted the aims and methods of antiquarian scholarship; his status as an antiquarian is confirmed in any case by his bibliography (see above), and by Pliny's description of him as *scholasticus* (*epist.* 1.24.4; he is dubbed γραμματικός in the *Suda*, and φιλόλογος by Lydus, *mag.* 1.34). One may add that scholarly ability and reputation were essential qualifications for the secretarial posts to which he was appointed by the emperor.[161] One of the best-known things about Suetonius is his application of the methods of scholarly biography to the lives of political figures. The lives of the Caesars are organized not chronologically but by topics (*per species*, as he himself describes it: *Aug.* 9.1). Whether or not it was his own innovation, the use of Alexandrian methods of scholarship in political biography is a very significant feature from a literary point of view,[162] but its importance in the present context lies in Suetonius' use of sources and his method of citing them.

Suetonius is, by ancient standards, rather generous in citing his sources. This point has been well made by Robert Kaster, whose fundamental edition of the *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* includes the following testimonial: 'he is well-read and learned, and he comes by his learning honestly. If Suetonius says that he saw something, we can take it that he saw it, if he cites a text, the probability is very high that he actually read it' (Kaster, xxxix–xl). He was particularly thorough and scrupulous in the study of works written by his subjects, including the Caesars; for example, he goes out of his way to confound the suggestion that Nero's poetry was written by someone else and passed off by the emperor as his own. Suetonius had himself handled the original manuscripts, written in Nero's own hand and marked by deletions and insertions (*Nero* 52). The attention paid to the works produced by his subjects explains the many testimonia that we have been able to take from Suetonius (eight from the *De grammaticis*, one from the *Vita Plinii*, and fourteen from the *Caesares*: most of the testimonia in Jerome are probably also taken from Suetonius). In these circumstances one might perhaps have expected him to have supplied more fragments than the thirty-two printed in this edition. The explanation lies in Suetonius' distinctive historical method, which deserves commendation as well as analysis.

It is fair to say that Suetonius, unlike most ancient historians and some of their modern successors, understood the fundamental distinction between primary and secondary sources. He cited primary documents frequently, often quoting them verbatim, in order to provide positive evidence (in contrast to the normal practice of ancient historians, who name only secondary authorities, if they name any at all, and

[161] See the fundamental discussion by Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 73–96.

[162] G. B. Townend (*AJPh* 108 (1987), 325–42) argues that Suetonius was preceded in this by Oppius (see introduction to Oppius (40)). However that may be, this characteristic feature of Suetonian biography inspired F. Leo's famous and influential theory that two distinct types of biography—the scholarly and the philosophical—had existed side by side in Greek literature since the time of Aristotle: F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihre literarische Form* (Berlin, 1901).

then only to disagree with them). Suetonius' primary sources sometimes included official documents, such as the *acta publica* or *diurna* (*Tib.* 5; *Cal.* 8.2; *Claud.* 41.3), the *acta senatus* (*Aug.* 5), and edicts (*Aug.* 28.2), but far more frequent are what might be called literary documents, such as orations (*Iul.* 6.1) and letters, e.g. of Cicero (*Iul.* 49.3; *Aug.* 3.2) and Mark Antony (*Aug.* 4.2; 7.1; 69.2; 70.1); but it is the letters of Augustus that have pride of place, being cited frequently and extensively, often verbatim (*Aug.* 51.3; 71.2–4; 76.1–2; 86.3; 92.2; *Tib.* 21.2–6; *Cal.* 8.4–5; *Claud.* 41–6). Other literary works are cited when they provide first-hand material, such as Cicero's *Brutus* (*Iul.* 55.1; 56.2) and *De officiis* (*Iul.* 30.5), but above all the works of the Caesars themselves, including their memoirs and historical works. Our fragments include four of Augustus (60 F11, 14, 15, 17), one of Tiberius (73 F1), and two of Claudius (75 F1, 8).

As for other historians, they are cited for the most part when they provide first-hand evidence of events they themselves experienced or of persons with whom they were directly acquainted; in the lives of Caesar, Augustus, and Tiberius, which contain the great majority of historical fragments, almost all the historians who are cited were contemporaries of the events and able to provide information from their own knowledge. Pollio, for instance, witnessed Caesar's words after the battle of Pharsalus (*Iul.* 30.2–4 = Pollio 56 F3a—the only verbatim quotation of a historical text in Suetonius). Cremutius Cordus was acquainted with men who had been present when Augustus purged the senate, and his account is cited as evidence of what happened on the day (*Aug.* 35.2 = Cremutius Cordus 71 F4); and another senatorial historian (probably Servilius Nonianus) was able to report an episode at a dinner party (*Tib.* 61.6 = Nonianus 79 F2). Many of the cited historians, however, are relatively obscure figures, some indeed otherwise unknown—Actorius Naso (43), Julius Marathus (65), C. Drusus (66), Aquilius Niger (67), Julius Saturninus (68). What distinguishes these citations is that they record information their authors were uniquely placed to provide, whether as eyewitnesses (see the examples cited above, and possibly also Julius Saturninus 68 F1) or close acquaintances able to supply intimate details about the subject (Actorius Naso 43 F1, Oppius 40 F8, C. Drusus 66 F1, Messalla Corvinus 61 F4). Of Julius Marathus, cited for Augustus' exact height and for a unique story about a portent of his birth (65 F1–2), Suetonius notes that he was the emperor's freedman and his personal secretary (*Aug.* 79.2). These authors are cited not as historians but as primary sources. The difference is crucial.

As for the standard historical accounts, the well-known works of Livy, Cremutius Cordus, Pliny, Servilius Nonianus, Cluvius Rufus, Fabius Rusticus, and the rest, they are cited either very rarely or not at all. The same is also true of writers contemporary with Suetonius such as Plutarch and Tacitus. That is because, for Suetonius, they represented secondary accounts, not primary sources. His failure to mention them does not mean that he did not know of them or neglected to read them. In fact it is likely that he had read the standard historical accounts of the principate (it would be surprising if he had not), and he makes occasional reference to them; but he does so almost always without naming them, using such formulae as *ut quidam putant*, *scribunt quidam*, *ut plurimi tradunt*, *sunt qui putent*, and so on. Many of these passages report variant interpretations in secondary accounts, which Suetonius challenges by reference to primary evidence. Examples occur at *Tib.* 21 and *Nero* 52, where the

opinions he rejects can be found in Tacitus (*ann.* 1.10.7 and 14.16.1 respectively)—although whether the *aliqui* mentioned at *Tib* 21.2 and the *quidam* at *Nero* 52 include Tacitus is not certain, quite apart from the question of whether the *Annals* were available to Suetonius (see Syme, *Tacitus*, 781–2; Goodyear on *ann.* 1.10.7).

The one case where Suetonius does name a secondary authority is the famous set-piece debate about Caligula's birthplace (*Cal.* 8). The discussion starts with the view of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (see I. Appendix 1, A14), who had claimed, probably in an epic poem, that the then ruling emperor Gaius Caligula was born at Tibur. The elder Pliny had denounced this as flattery, and quoted epigraphic evidence in support of the popular belief that he was born at Ambitarvium (near Koblenz) in Germany. But Suetonius rejects this too in favour of Antium, which was recorded as Gaius' birthplace in the *acta*. He refutes Pliny, first by showing that the evidence he had quoted was not conclusive (the inscriptions commemorating Agrippina's safe delivery at Ambitarvium might refer to a different child), and then by quoting a letter of Augustus proving that Gaius had been born nearly two years before Agrippina set out for Germany. This careful piece of argumentation is unparalleled in ancient historiography. It shows that Suetonius had clearly grasped the point that the only way to decide between rival versions of a historical event is to test them against the available evidence. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Suetonius has for once named the secondary author in question out of respect for Pliny, a kindred spirit who used the same scholarly methods: Pliny's own practice of citing epigraphic evidence was unusual among ancient historians.[163] Elsewhere in the *Caesars* Suetonius refers to secondary authorities, especially historians, anonymously and, it seems, dismissively.

One final point needs to be made about Suetonius' manner of citing sources. It is evident to every reader that the *Caesars* changes its character in the later lives, which are inferior in many respects to the earlier ones. They are not only much shorter—the last six lives occupy two of the eight books, whereas the first six take up a book each; they also display far less wealth of detail and a tendency towards generalization. Individuals are named less often and are replaced by generic plurals, and single instances of emperors' behaviour are turned into characteristic tendencies.[164] These signs of deteriorating quality begin to appear already in the life of Tiberius, and are matched by a marked decrease in the number and frequency of citations from primary sources. The numerous references to documents, letters, and personal memoirs, which are such a notable feature of the lives of Julius Caesar and Augustus, are virtually absent from the later lives. And even in the lives of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius most of the cited documents relate to the period before AD 14. This distinctive pattern applies equally to citations of historians, with most of the fragments coming from the first two lives, and none from the lives of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian.

[163] Thus Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 89, a page to which this discussion is indebted. Wallace-Hadrill's statement, 'Suetonius' method here is not that of the historian, but that of the scholar' (cf. 64: '. . . his very unhistorical approach'), is a clear illustration of the difference between ancient and modern historiography. Suetonius' scholarly discussion of Caligula's birthplace is parodied in the *Historia Augusta* (*Hist* [Vopisc.] *Car.* 4.4): see A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1994), 1137–8; Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 779–80.

[164] These features are well described and documented by G. B. Townend, *CQ* 9 (1959), 288–9.

Various explanations have been proposed, the most obvious being that the change coincided with Suetonius' dismissal from his post as *ab epistulis*. Although the opening pages of the work are lost, we know that the work carried a dedication to his patron, the praetorian prefect Septicius Clarus. This must have been written while Clarus was still in office—that is, before 122, when he too was dismissed. But if Suetonius' work was still incomplete—that is to say, if only the first two lives had been completed and published—it becomes possible to explain why the later lives are less carefully researched, either because he lost interest in the project, or because he no longer had access to the palace archives, or indeed both. It is evident, however, that the attention Suetonius gave to the period of Caesar and Augustus is matched by a similar bias in his other literary and antiquarian studies. The grammarians and rhetoricians, and indeed the other literary figures who, according to Jerome, featured in the *De uiris illustribus*, almost all belong to the period of the republic and the age of Augustus. Only a small minority of the poets, historians, orators, philosophers, and the rest were active under the Julio-Claudians, and virtually none under the Flavians. This has led some to argue that the manifest superiority of Suetonius' lives of Caesar and Augustus is no more than a reflection of his specialized knowledge and enthusiasm for the 'golden age', and has nothing to do with his disgrace.[165] However that may be, the later lives are perfunctory efforts, and unfortunately do not provide much information about historical writing under the Julio-Claudians and Flavians; they are no match for the rich store of fragments and testimonia Suetonius gives us for the age of Caesar and Augustus.

On the text of the *De uita Caesarum* see S. J. Tibbetts in *Texts and Transmission*, 399–404, and on that of the *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* R. A. Kaster, *Studies on the Text of Suetonius 'De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus'* (London, 1992). Kaster's edition of that work, with translation and detailed commentary (Oxford, 1995), is fundamental, but is strangely ignored by M.-C. Vacher (ed.), *Suétone: grammariens et rhéteurs* (Paris, 2003).

The issues dealt with here are touched on in the following: A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900); Syme, *Tacitus*; G. B. Townend, 'The date of composition of Suetonius' *Caesares*', *CQ* 9 (1959), 285–93; R. Syme, 'Biographers of the Caesars', *MH* 37 (1980), 104–28 (= *RP* 3, 1251–74); B. Baldwin, *Suetonius* (Amsterdam, 1983); Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*; J. Gascou, *Suétone historien* (Rome, 1984); T. Powers, 'Pliny, *Letters* 5.10 and the literary career of Suetonius', *JRS* 100 (2010), 140–62.

(TJC)

Syncellus (George Synkellos)

The Byzantine chronicler George was *synkellos* (adviser) to Tarasios, patriarch of Constantinople from 784 to 806, and is now usually known by this title. His chronicle, entitled in one manuscript *Ekloge chronographias* ('Selection of Chronography'), combined chronographic argument with a running history, as in other Byzantine chronicles, but the chronographic material is unusually elaborate. The work began

[165] Thus, above all, A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900), 361. T. Powers, *JRS* 100 (2010), 159–62, denies that there is any decline in quality in the later lives and argues that all the *De uita Caesarum* may have been completed before Suetonius's dismissal.

with the Creation, dated, as was by then traditional, to 5,500 years before Christ's incarnation, and by the time of his death Syncellus had carried it up to the beginning of Diocletian's reign (AD 285). It was then completed up to 813 by Theophanes. The work is now excellently served by the edition of A. A. Mosshammer (Leipzig, Teubner, 1984), and the annotated translation by W. Adler and P. Tuffin (*The Chronography of George Synkellos* (Oxford, 2002)). On Syncellus' place in Christian chronography see also W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington, DC, 1989), esp. 132 ff.

Syncellus made much use of the earlier Christian chronographers Africanus, Eusebius, Annianus, and Panadorus, although he was often highly critical of them, particularly Eusebius. His work includes extensive, unattributed transcriptions from both books of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, to which he is thus a main witness, particularly for the extracts from earlier sources given in Eusebius' *Chronographia*, the first book of his *Chronicle*, which was not translated by Jerome (see further above on Eusebius, I. 65–6). Syncellus also sometimes consulted Eusebius' sources for himself (for example on Macedonian history, where he gives larger excerpts than Eusebius from Porphyry and Diodorus). Syncellus' work is organized under 'Years of the World', and the arrangement is often confusing, with the boundary between source extracts and Syncellus' own discussion liable to be obscured.

Apropos of the foundation of Rome, Syncellus (226–30) reproduces some of the material from Dionysius and Diodorus which Eusebius transcribed in the Roman section of his *Chronographia*: here Syncellus is clearly following Eusebius rather than going back to the original sources. He is a witness, along with the fuller report in the Armenian translation, for the fragment of Fabius (1 F3) transmitted through Diodorus and Eusebius. Syncellus (419) is also one of several sources who reproduced the information Eusebius gave in the *Canons* on the Domitianic persecution, with its citation of Bruttius (98 F3).

(JWR)

Tacitus

A native of Gallia Cisalpina or Narbonensis, but with Italian ancestry on his mother's side, Cornelius Tacitus (his *praenomen* is unknown) lived from the mid-fifties AD until early in the reign of Hadrian. As a historian of the period AD 14–96, whose final work, the *Annales*, in sixteen or eighteen books, dealt with the reigns of the Julio-Claudian emperors, and his earlier *Histories*, in twelve or fourteen books, with those of the 'Four Emperors' of AD 69 and the Flavian dynasty, Tacitus had good reason to cite, and to improve upon, his predecessors.

Gaps in the text of both his major works hide some of his selections from us, and so something of his methodology. In the *Annales* events of AD 29–31 and 37–47 are missing, and they finally break off in 66; the *Histories* fail as early as 70, before the Flavian regime was settled. For the later Flavian period historical works would have been less significant: the senatorial author could rely on his own and his contemporaries' experience and on contemporary family memoirs. Tacitus states in the *Annales* that he accepts the unanimous account of his sources and mentions individual writers only when they diverge (13.20.2). Scholars have not found this admission hard

to accept, but his claim to have searched writers and state records for traces of the participation of Antonia at Germanicus' obsequies in AD 20 and to have failed to find them (*ann.* 3.3.2) has been sceptically greeted, with little justification, as a rhetorical flourish. On the other hand, R. Syme's insistence on the *acta senatus* as a constant prime source (replacing various literary suggestions) seems equally extreme. Tacitus, writing history, read his predecessors, suppressing the slavish, of whom Velleius Paterculus would have been a specimen, or vituperative (*ann.* 1.1.2 f.). He also read the *acta*, with an eye to notable examples of conduct creditable and the reverse (*ann.* 3.65.1: slavishness here was part of history), and when literary material was sparse, as in the years between the trial of Cn. Piso and the death of Drusus Caesar (AD 20–3, *ann.* 3.20–76), his reading of the *acta* became more intense, for they pointed up the precarious influence of the senate in those years. He does not make a special virtue of his use of them.

Tacitus' selection includes the well-known writers Aufidius Bassus, Servilius Nonianus, Cluvius Rufus, Fabius Rusticus, and the elder Pliny. He singles out passages relevant to his overall purpose and likely to take the interest of his readers, such as that on Agrippina the Elder at the Rhine bridge (*ann.* 1.69.1–2: Pliny 80 F2), and the crucial content of Cremutius Cordus' fatal history (4.34.1: Cremutius Cordus 71 F3a). Individual items of interest Tacitus took not only from his main sources but also, with some pride, from remoter sources, such as the memoirs of Agrippina the Younger (4.53.1–2: Agrippina 77 F1).

His critical attention to divergences is especially marked in the Neronian books, as at *ann.* 13.20.1–2 (Pliny 80 F4, Cluvius Rufus 84 F2, Fabius Rusticus 87 F2), where, in AD 55, the loyalty of the praetorian prefect Afranius Burrus is in question between the three authors; cf. 14.2.1–2 (Cluvius Rufus 84 F3, Fabius Rusticus 87 F3). Additional information from individual authors is brought in here as in the earlier books: he mentions, but is sceptical of, Claudius' daughter Antonia's involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy of 65 (*ann.* 15.53.2–3: Pliny 80 F5); and material on the role of Faenius Rufus the praetorian prefect in Seneca's fate is specially brought in from Fabius Rusticus (15.60.1–61.6: Fabius Rusticus 87 F4).

Military autobiographers such as Suetonius Paulinus and Vespasian might have found openings in those narratives, but we find only Domitius Corbulo, intent, as Tacitus points out, on enhancing his own role in Nero's Parthian war (*ann.* 15.16.1–3: Corbulo 82 F2).

As to the monographs *Germania* and *Agricola*, no historian is named as a source in the former, and only Fabius Rusticus in the latter (10.3: 87 F1), and then merely as an authority on a par with Livy for the shape of Britain. In the section of the *Histories* dealing with the struggle between the forces of Vitellius and Vespasian, Tacitus twice uses the account of Vipstanus Messalla, an author he respected and presumably knew personally. On the first occasion it is for an incident of particular horror, in which a son kills his father: *hist.* 3.25.2–3 (Vipstanus Messalla 86 F1); on the second, more significant, occasion there is a question of responsibility for the assault on Cremona, where Pliny the Elder blames M. Antonius Primus, Messalla the freedman Hormus: 3.27.3–28.1 (Pliny 80 F8, Vipstanus Messalla 86 F2). Tacitus' inability to decide between the two accounts is based not on their authors' merits as historians but on the characters of Antonius and Hormus.

By contrast with imperial historiography there was little occasion for Tacitus to quote pre-Tiberian authors. As noted above (5.1.5), he has one citation each from Sulla, Sisenna, and Tiro. These authorities do not serve the same function as the later ones, and it is worth noticing in what circumstances he introduced them. In *ann.* 4.56.2 (Sulla 22 F27) a deputation from Smyrna before the senate in AD 26 and insisting on the city's services to Rome called Sulla as witness (*testem*) to the help it had rendered him in 85 BC, during the First Mithridatic War. In *hist.* 3.51.2 (Sisenna 26 F132) Sisenna is cited for another horrific incident: in the civil wars between Sulla and Cinna a soldier who unwittingly killed his brother committed suicide; this is in contrast with the conduct of a Flavian cavalryman, who demanded a reward for the same deed, illustrating the greater sensibility of the earlier generation, and providing the historian, when appropriate, with *exempla recti* or *solacia mali*. Tiro is cited by the orator M. Aper in *dial.* 2 (Tiro 46 F3) simply as the secure source for the date of Cicero's death. Two of these citations are not brought in by Tacitus himself but by his characters, and confirm their own 'histories' rather than his; and one serves a moral rather than an intellectual purpose.

Standard commentaries on *ann.* include those of E. Koestermann (complete); F. R. D. Goodyear (books 1–2); A. J. Woodman, R. H. Martin (books 3–6). On *hist.*: C. Damon (book 1); R. Ash (book 2); K. Wellesley (book 3); G. E. F. Chilver, G. B. Townend (books 4–5). On *Agric.*: R. M. Ogilvie, I. A. Richmond.

Selected special studies: R. Syme, *Tacitus* (2 vols., Oxford, 1958); id., *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (Oxford, 1970); R. Martin, *Tacitus* (London, 1981); J. Ginsburg, *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus* (Salem, Mass., 1981); A. J. Woodman, *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford, 1998); R. Ash, *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories* (London, 1999); E. O'Gorman, *Irony and Misreading in the Annals of Tacitus* (Cambridge, 2000); H. Haynes, *The History of Make-believe: Tacitus on Imperial Rome* (Berkeley, etc., 2003); A. J. Woodman (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Tacitus* (Cambridge, 2009); V. E. Pagán (ed.), *A Companion to Tacitus* (Malden, Mass., 2011).

(BML)

TERTULLIAN

Born around AD 160 in or near Carthage, Tertullian (full name Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus) wrote a substantial number of polemical tracts in which he defended Christianity from its detractors, trumpeted the virtues of martyrdom, and continued during a long life (he lived to be about 80) to move further and further towards a position of doctrinal rigour, starting with Montanism and then founding his own sect. Most of his work is rooted in a knowledge of the Bible, but there was more to Tertullian than this.[166]

The issue of his education and background is clouded by the fact that Eusebius (*hist. eccl.* 2.2.4) thought Tertullian was a lawyer, and so some excerpts in the Justinianic code have been attributed to him.[167] There are traces of legal knowledge in

[166] T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford, 1971, rev. 1985) remains a standard work, with a detailed account of his use of sources at 187–210.

[167] O. Lenel, *Palingenesia Iuris Civilis* (Leipzig, 1889), 2. 342–3.

the other works, as well as a rebarbative aggressive argumentation; but the identification is not wholly plausible, and may be attributing too much professionalism to the concept of a jurist, as opposed to someone well trained in rhetorical habits.[168] More securely, we can see that Tertullian was capable of reading carefully and responding to complex works such as those of Soranus and Marcion which attacked Christianity, and he must have known Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics in the original.[169] In fact Tertullian makes large claims for his learning; he cites over thirty authorities in the *Apologeticum* alone, and they include several Greek authors, notably Herodotus and Plato, and Latin authors such as Pliny the Younger, Tacitus, and Juvenal, who then are not clearly known until the fourth century.

How much Roman history did he know? The following is a sample of citations. Scattered through the treatises are the usual rather generic references to Romulus (*apol.* 6.5, the woman put to death for drinking in the time of Romulus), Numa (regularly referred to for originating Rome's religious practices), the sack of Rome by the Gauls, and the Hannibalic War (*apol.* 40.8–9). In terms of knowledge of ancient writers, he knew Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* (regularly quoted in *De anima*, and perhaps the source of *apol.* 11.8, the story of Lucullus' discovery of cherry trees, found also at Pliny *nat.* 15.25.102), and he knew the famous letter of Pliny the Younger (*epist.* 10.96) regarding the treatment of the Christians in Bithynia (*apol.* 2.6). He knew Varro, and in a way that foreshadowed Augustine, used him to show the folly of Roman religion (*Ad nationes* II is full of Varro, and he is found in many other places). He quotes Sallust (*anim.* 20) and Tacitus (*apol.* 16.1), and in *De spectaculis* 5 it appears he used Suetonius' lost work on games, just as he used a lost work of Claudius Saturninus on crowns in his own *De corona*.

We have accepted that he quoted Augustus' memoirs on his dreams, although it required an amendment to the text (Augustus 60 F4). He quotes Fenestella for a hermaphrodite at Luna, but has garbled the citation somehow (Fenestella 70 F4; see commentary). In a long passage on games in *De spectaculis* 5, which as he indicated was taken from Suetonius or Suetonius' authorities, he quotes Piso (Piso 9 F9) for the games which Romulus instituted for Jupiter Feretrius, and it seems reasonable to assume that he is quoting via Suetonius there.

Nothing so far would incline one to believe that Tertullian was gathering his information by diligent original research into Roman historians rather than by a broad knowledge and wide reading, and the most significant set of citations, repeated in *Apologeticus* 10.7 and *Ad nationes* 2.12, would seem to confirm an intermediary source. Tertullian cites Diodorus, Thallus, Cassius Severus, and Cornelius Nepos (Nepos 45 F2b) for the view that Saturn was a man (and adds Tacitus in the second place, presumably in reference to *hist.* 5.4, a section on the Jews which Tertullian knew and used: *apol.* 16.1). The Nepos reference is relatively unproblematic; it would fit well early in his *Chronica*. However, the reference to Cassius Severus is more difficult; the Augustan orator, whose books were burnt, does not seem all that likely, and by far the most obvious replacement is Cassius Hemina, whose euhemerism was well known.

[168] Barnes, *Tertullian*, 22–9; D. I. Rankin, 'Was Tertullian a jurist?', *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997), 335–42.

[169] Important account in J. H. Waszink, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De anima* (Amsterdam, 1947), 21–47.

Diodorus the Greek is almost certainly Diodorus Siculus. Thallus, a euhemerizing Greek chonographer, is discussed by Jacoby (*FGrHist* 256).[170] He cannot be dated with any certainty; most guesses place him in the early imperial period as a secretary of Augustus or a freedman of Tiberius, but the latter individual is a creation of a modern emendation of Josephus. So one may imagine a source which gathered these authorities up, and made a bit of a mess. Whether the error regarding Cassius was already made by Nepos, or was made by the intermediary source, we cannot tell; we do know that Thallus is included in another list of Greek authorities at *apol.* 19.6, all cited for chronological matters, and again almost certainly through an intermediary.

What is clear is that this passage then becomes the source for Minucius Felix, and for Lactantius, who both repeat the error regarding Cassius (if indeed it is an error). Tertullian's influence on the later church was strong, and certainly Minucius Felix, a very close contemporary, appears to have known his work.

Text: *Corpus Christianorum*, Series Latina I–II (1954); the *Apologeticum* and *De spectaculis* are also available in Loeb (ed. T. R. Glover, 1931). In addition to works already cited, see S. Price, 'Latin Christian apologetics: Minucius Felix, Tertullian and Cyprian', in M. J. Edwards *et al.* (eds.) *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford, 2002), 105–30. For a more recent overview and translations of some less-known works, see G. D. Dunn, *Tertullian* (London, 2004).

(CJS)

Valerius Maximus

Valerius Maximus (no *praenomen* is attested) lived in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (he was thus a contemporary of Velleius Paterculus) and probably completed his work, entitled *Facta et dicta memorabilia* and dedicated to the emperor, between AD 29 and 31. The manuscripts present it in nine books, though at an earlier stage the division appears to have been into ten. As the title indicates, it consists largely of a series of *exempla* relating notable deeds and sayings, though book 2 is mainly concerned with political and social institutions, and a number of the *exempla* concern those responsible for innovations. In many cases the *exempla* have a moral purpose, and Valerius frequently adds moralizing comments.

The *exempla*, naturally, largely concern Rome and Romans, but a minority refer to foreign peoples; in the reference system (that of K. Kempf) these constitute a separate series for the chapters in which they occur, labelled *ext(erna)*, though 2.6 consists entirely of non-Roman *exempla* and hence lacks the label.

Valerius rarely indicates his sources (he made extensive use, often verging on plagiarism, of Cicero and Livy), but he preserves four of our fragments, none verbatim but two carrying a book number. His citation (1.7.6) of Coelius (15 F49b) is taken at second hand from Cicero (*diu.* 1.56=F49a).

The work was extremely popular in the Renaissance, providing a mass of information in a form more readily digestible than, for example, in Livy, and covering periods for which Livy did not survive or had not yet been rediscovered. If translations and

[170] For a rare treatment of Thallus, see B. Garstad, 'Theophilus of Antioch, Pseudo-Justin and Thallus' treatment of Moses', *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001) 207–9.

commentaries are included, there are more than 800 manuscripts of Valerius, more than any other pagan text except Priscian (see above).

In addition to J. Briscoe's Teubner text (1998), there is an excellent Loeb edition by D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, Mass., 1999), and a commentary on book 1 by D. Wardle (Oxford, 1998). See also W. M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (London, 1992); C. Skidmore, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus* (Exeter, 1996).

(JB/JWR)

VARRO

For information about the career and writings of M. Terentius Varro see the introduction to Varro 52. The present section deals only with the surviving works that preserve fragments of lost historians, namely the *De lingua Latina* and the *De re rustica*—although it is worth briefly mentioning the important fact that Varro's lost antiquarian works, especially the *Antiquitates*, the *De gente p. R.*, and the *De uita p. R.*, were extensively used by our existing citing authorities, and were the intermediary sources that lie behind a great many second-hand quotations, for example in the grammarians, the Christian apologists (Arnobius, Lactantius, Minucius Felix), Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Pliny the Elder, Plutarch, Aulus Gellius, Censorinus, Solinus, Servius, and Johannes Lydus (see the discussion of each of these).

The *De lingua Latina*, in twenty-five books, was written and published before the death of Cicero, to whom it is dedicated. Only books 5–10 survive, in an imperfect state: the extant archetype, the eleventh-century *Laurentianus* 51.10 (F), has a number of gaps and is very corrupt. Of the surviving books, 5–7 deal with etymology, while 8–10 are concerned with analogy and anomaly. The former group contains numerous illustrative quotations from poets, especially in book 7—unsurprisingly, since the theme of that book is poetic words: Ennius and Plautus are by far the most quoted, followed by Accius, Lucilius, Naevius, and Pacuvius. With quotations from drama Varro sometimes names the title of the play, but not invariably; the same is true of Ennius' *Annals*, which he names sometimes but not always, and never cites with the book number. Many of his verse quotations are given without the name of the author: the implication is that an educated reader—and of course the dedicatee, Cicero—would be expected to know. References to prose texts are extremely rare by comparison. He quotes documents, including the Twelve Tables and other laws, priestly books, *censoriae tabulae* (6.86–7), and *commentarii consulares* (6.88). There are occasional references to prose literature; authors mentioned by name include Aelius (Stilo), Junius (Congus Gracchanus), and Cosconius, but most of Varro's citations of earlier authorities are anonymous, in the form *alii . . . alii . . .* or some such.[171]

Historians are cited very rarely. Apart from two anonymous references to *annales* (i.e. Roman historians: 5.74, 5.101), he refers twice to *Piso in annalibus* (5.149, 5.165). The first of these references occurs in a discussion of the Lacus Curtius (5.148–50), the only example in the *De lingua Latina* where Varro names the authors of competing versions. Two of these are historians (Piso 9 F8, Lutatius 32 F11); the others are

[171] e.g. 5.49; for a list of such entries see R. G. Kent's Loeb edition, index, s.v. 'Grammatici et similes, *sine nomine citati*'.

Procilius (see I. Appendix 1, A32) and the problematic and otherwise unknown Cornelius Stilo.[172] The second citation of Piso (5.165=Piso 9 F11) concerns the practice of closing the doors of Janus in peacetime.[173]

In the later books (8–10) Varro is extremely sparing with quotations and references. There is a handful of verse quotations in books 9 and 10, but nothing in book 8 apart from the single quotation of Sisenna at 8.73, quoted perhaps because his use of the phrase *patres familiarum* (required by analogy) was unusual, instead of the standard (but anomalous) idiom *patres familias* (see comm. on Sisenna 26 F136).

The three books on agriculture (*De re rustica*), written in 37 BC, take the form of a dialogue and deal with arable farming (book 1), flocks and herds (book 2), and poultry, small birds, bees, etc. (book 3). At the start of the work Varro lists over fifty Greek writers on agriculture, but individual references to them in the work are rare; and in Varro's opinion they are all surpassed by the work of the Carthaginian Mago (1.1.10). Of the Roman agricultural writers he cites Cato and Saserna;[174] the opinions of Tremellius Scrofa are presented directly, as he is one of the speakers in the dialogue, but it is likely that Varro has based them on Scrofa's published work. The importance of the *De re rustica* for our purposes lies in its reference to Piso at 2.1.9 on the origin of the name 'Italia' (Piso 9 F1), and above all for the three quotations from Cato's *Origines*, all dealing with agricultural matters. All are quoted verbatim; two of them (F46a, 47) are attributed specifically to the *Origines* (but without the book number), while the third (F48) presumably comes from Cato's account of Cisalpine Gaul in book 2 or 3 of that work. The latter fragment presents serious textual problems, and is a reminder of the fact that the existing text is seriously defective, depending as it does on a complex manuscript tradition that derives ultimately from a single now-lost manuscript, the so-called *Marcianus*.

On the textual transmission of the *De re rustica* (preserved together with Cato's *De agri cultura*) see M. D. Reeve in *Texts and Transmission*, 40–2, and on that of the *De lingua Latina* L. D. Reynolds, ibid. 430–1. In general see J. Collart, *Varron grammairien latin* (Paris, 1954); J. E. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar* (Copenhagen, 1968).

(TJC)

Velleius Paterculus

Velleius Paterculus' brief history was dedicated to M. Vinicius in celebration of his consulship in AD 30. The work was conceived as a single *uolumen* (1.14.1, 2.131.1), but has come down to us in two books. Most of the first book is lost, but the second survives substantially intact except for a lacuna at 2.29.5. The small surviving section from early in the first book (1.1–8) shows that the work began as a universal history, but by the time the extant work resumes near the end of the first book (1.9), Velleius has reached the Third Macedonian War and the focus has become exclusively Roman. The highly compressed narrative becomes somewhat more expansive as Velleius approaches his own time, when it conveys fervent loyalty to Augustus and Tiberius.

[172] See the apparatus to Lutatius 32 F11, and comm. ad loc.

[173] On the supposed reference to Catulus at 6.6 see commentary on Catulus 19 F4, where we prefer to take it as referring to Pacuvius.

[174] Note esp. 1.18–19, where the opinions of Cato and Saserna are critically compared and discussed.

Velleius makes frequent reference to himself and his family. His origins were Campanian, and, after extensive military service, his career culminated in a praetorship in AD 15. He repeatedly announces his intention to write a full-length history, but we hear nothing further of this project.

Velleius includes several digressions in which he notes leading authors flourishing in particular periods. The third of these digressions contains important chronological indications for Sisenna, Coelius, Rutilius, Quadrigarius, and Antias (2.9.4–6=GT4): on its interpretation and reliability see the introductions to Sisenna and Antias.

At several points Velleius comments in various ways on his sources, but only twice in the extant work does he do so by name, both times in contexts relating to his native Campania: at 1.7.5 he criticizes Cato's date for the foundation of Capua (Cato 5 F52), and at 2.16.2 he tells us that Hortensius in his *Annales* praised Velleius' ancestor Minatus Magius, who served on the Roman side in the Social War (Hortensius 31 T2).

As has long been recognized, the citation of Aemilius Sura (103 F1, our only attestation for that author) at 1.6.6 must be an interpolated gloss.

There are editions with commentary of the whole of Velleius' work by M. Elefante (Hildesheim, 1997) and of 2.41–131 by A. J. Woodman (Cambridge, 1977, 1983), a translation by J. C. Yardley and A. A. Barrett (Indianopolis, 2011), and collected studies in E. Cowan (ed.), *Velleius Paterculus: Making History* (Swansea, 2011).

(JWR)

INTRODUCTIONS TO INDIVIDUAL HISTORIANS

Annales Maximi

Editions: J.-V. Le Clerc, *Des journaux chez les Romains, recherches précedées d'un mémoire sur les Annales des Pontifes, et suivies de fragments des journaux de l'ancienne Rome* (Paris, 1838), 344–73; Peter 1^2. 3–4; Frier, *Libri Annales* (1979), 297–321; Chassignet 1. 1–16.

Principal discussions: Frier, *Libri Annales* (1979) gives a comprehensive overview of the issues and earlier debate, and subsequent contributions are surveyed in his second (1999) edition (v–xix). Other discussions include: L. de Beaufort, *Dissertation sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire romaine*[2] (La Haye, 1750), ch. 4 (=new edn., ed. A. Blot (Paris, 1866), 32–48); Niebuhr, *RG* 1^3 (1828), 262–5 (=*Hist. Rome* 1 (1831), 246–9); Le Clerc, *Des journaux chez les Romains* (1838), 1–178; W. A. Becker, *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer nach den Quellen bearbeitet* 1 (Leipzig, 1843), 4–11; Niebuhr, *Vorträge über römische Geschichte*, ed. M. Isler (Berlin, 1846), 5–9 (=*Lectures on the History of Rome*[3], ed. L. Schmitz (London, 1870), 5–7); Schwegler, *RG* 1 (1853), 7–12; J. G. Hulleman, *Disputatio critica de annalibus maximis* (Amsterdam, 1855); G. C. Lewis, *An Inquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History* (London, 1855), 1. 155–69; Mommsen, *RG*[2] (1856–7) 1, 432–6; 2, 453–4 (=*Hist. Rome* (1877–80), 1, 477–80; 3, 469); K. Niemeyer, review of Hulleman, *Disputatio*, in *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 12 (1858), 423–8; E. Huebner, 'Die Annales Maximi der Römer', *NJPhP* 79 (1859), 401–23; O. Seeck, *Die Kalendertafel der Pontifices* (Berlin, 1885), esp. 61–75, 83–99; C. Cichorius, 'Annales', *RE* 1 (1894), 2248–56; W. Soltau, 'Die Entstehung der Annales Maximi', *Philologus* 55 (1896), 257–76; A.-G. Amatucci, 'Gli Annales Maximi', *RFIC* 24 (1896), 208–33; L. Cantarelli, 'Origine degli Annales Maximi', *RFIC* 26 (1898), 209–29; A. Enmann, 'Die älteste Redaction der Pontificalannalen', *RhM* 57 (1902), 517–33; L. Wülker, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienwesens bei den Römern* (Leipzig, 1903), 50–70; De Sanctis, *SR* 1 (1907), 16–21; Soltau, *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leipzig, 1909), 10–16, 156–8, 207–12, 230–7; E. Kornemann, 'Die älteste Form der Pontifikalannalen', *Klio* 11 (1911), 245–57; Kornemann, *Der Priestercodex in der Regia und die Entstehung der altrömischen Pseudogeschichte* (Tübingen, 1912); E. Pais, *Storia critica di Roma durante i primi cinque secoli* 1.1 (Rome, 1913), 52–74; Peter 1^2 (1914), iii–xxix; Soltau, 'Das Pontifikale Jahrbuch und seine Rekonstruktion', *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* 17 (1914/15), 321–42; Beloch, *RG* (1926), 86–95; C. W. Westrup, *On the Antiquarian-Historiographical Activities of the Roman Pontifical College* (*Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selskab, Hist.-Filol. Meddelelser* 16.3 (Copenhagen), 1929), 31–45; M. Gelzer, 'Der Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes* 69 (1934) 46–55 (=*Kleine Schriften* (1964), 3. 93–103); J. E. A. Crake, 'The annals of the Pontifex Maximus', *CPh* 35 (1940), 375–86; Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), 60–6, 282–7; P. Fraccaro, 'The history of Rome in the regal period', *JRS* 47 (1957), 59–65; G. Perl, 'Der Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *F&F* 38 (1964), 185–9, 213–8; Alföldi, *Early Rome* (1965), 164–9; Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria' (1967), 150–4; E. Rawson, 'Prodigy lists and the use of the *Annales Maximi*', *CQ* 21 (1971), 158–69 (=*Roman Culture* (1991), 1–15); R. A. Bauman, *Lawyers in Roman Republican Politics* (Munich, 1983), 91–2, 290–8; Cornell, 'Formation' (1986), 71–2; R. Drews, 'Pontiffs, prodigies, and the disappearance of the Annales Maximi', *CPh* 83 (1988), 289–99; B. Gentili and G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought* (Amsterdam, 1988), 87–95; G. P. Verbrugghe, 'On the meaning of *annales*, on the meaning of annalist', *Philologus* 133 (1989), 192–230; R. M. Ogilvie, *CAH*[2] 7.2 (1989), 6–7; A. Drummond, ibid. 19–21; A. Momigliano, ibid. 88; G. D'Anna, 'La testimonianza di Cicerone sugli Annales

Maximi', *Ciceroniana* 7 (1990), 223–30; K.-E. Petzold, 'Annales Maximi und Annalen', *Festschr. H. Zimmermann* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 3–16 (=Petzold, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtschreibung. Kleine Schriften zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1999), 252–65); K.-E. Petzold, 'Zur Geschichte des römischen Annalistik', in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius: Aspekte seines Werkes* (Konstanz, 1993), 151–88 (=Petzold, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtschreibung* (1999), 184–221); J. Rüpke, 'Livius, Priesternamen und die *annales maximi*', *Klio* 75 (1993), 155–79; Forsythe, *Piso* (1994), 53–73; G. S. Bucher, 'The *Annales Maximi* in the light of Roman methods of keeping records', *AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 3–61; Cornell, *Beginnings* (1995), 13–15; Chassignet 1 (1996), xxiii–xlii; Oakley, *Comm.* 1 (1997), 24–7; Walt, *Macer* (1997), 119–32; J. Scheid, 'Les annales des pontifes. Une hypothèse de plus', in *Convegno per Santo Mazzarino* (Rome, 1998), 199–220; D. Flach, *Römische Geschichtsschreibung* (3rd edn., Darmstadt, 1998), 56–60; G. Forsythe, 'The Roman historians of the second century BC', in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic* (Rome, 2000), 1–13; Beck–Walter 1 (2001), 32–7; J. Vaahtera, 'Livy and the priestly records: à propos ILS 9338', *Hermes* 130 (2002), 100–8; T. P. Wiseman, 'History, poetry and *annales*', in D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis (eds.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poets and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography* (Leiden, 2002), 331–62 (=Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome* (Exeter, 2008), 243–70); H. and A. Petersmann, in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 60–3; E. A. Meyer, *Legitimacy and Law in the Roman World: Tabulae in Roman Belief and Practice* (Cambridge, 2004), 25, 30–3; U. Walter, *Memoria und res publica: Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom* (Frankfurt a.M., 2004), 196–204; G. Forsythe, *Critical History of Early Rome* (Berkeley, 2005), 69–72; Oakley, *Comm.* 4 (2005), 479–84; H. Beck, 'The early Roman tradition', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford, 2007), 259–65; D. Engels, *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen (753–27 v. Chr.)* (Stuttgart, 2007), 60–86; A. Rodríguez Mayorgas, 'Antes de la historia: Anales Máximos, escritura y memoria en la Roma Republicana', *Gerión* 25 (2007), 263–84; J. Rüpke, *Fasti Sacerdotum: A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 449* (Oxford, 2008), 24–38; J. H. Richardson, 'The Vestal Virgins and the use of the *Annales Maximi*', in J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo (eds.), *Priests and State in the Roman World* (Stuttgart, 2011), 91–106; Cornell, 'annales maximi', *OCD*[4] (2012), 95.

INTRODUCTION

A number of sources refer to an annual record of events kept by the Pontifex Maximus. The principal accounts show that the record was the responsibility of the Pontifex Maximus alone, not the pontifical college (T1–3; cf. 5, 12): references in later sources to the *pontifices* (T6–11; F1–4) are either loose writing or erroneous.

The record is sometimes described simply as a 'tablet' (*tabula*, *πίναξ*: T1, 5; cf. 2, 3). Elsewhere the term *annales* is used, in various forms. According to Cicero (T2), the record was known as *Annales Maximi* well before 91 BC (the dramatic date of the *De oratore*). It may have acquired the name earlier enough for Ennius to take *Annales* from it as title for his poem; alternatively, the record may not have acquired this name until later in the second century, after the term *annales* had come to be used of literary accounts in verse and prose. The name may mean just 'the greatest annals', but various sources (T3, 9, 12) explain the word *maximi* as alluding to the Pontifex Maximus.[1]

[1] See further Frier, *Libri Annales*, 46–8, 195–6. Frier's view that the unattested form *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum* was the original name for the chronicle is unfounded. For Ennius' title see Skutsch, *Ennius*, 6–7.

Cato's dismissive remark (T1) is the only reference to the record to survive from the period when it was still being kept. Our fullest information is supplied by the parallel accounts of Cicero (T2) and Servius Danielis (T3). Of these, Cicero is the more authoritative witness, but his evidence about the compilation of the record cannot be treated with complete confidence, since he wrote long after it had ceased to be maintained. Cicero passes judgement on its style (T2, 4) and shows some knowledge of its contents (F5, and perhaps also T13 and F11), but may well not have consulted the record himself.

After Cicero, references to the Pontifex Maximus' record are sparse. Three passages in Livy (T14a, T15, F12) have often been taken as alluding to it, though in each case the reference is not certain.[2] Dionysius mentions the record explicitly in one passage, where he speaks of the 'tablet kept by the Pontifices Maximi' (T5).[3] He has been thought to cite it at several points, but in each case the reference is questionable, and so we have here included the passages in question only as doubtful fragments (F7–10). At F7–9 he appears to be applying a general theory that early historians drew information from archival sources, which he states for Greek writers at *Thuc.* 5, and may not have had a particular archive in mind. At F10 his reference is probably not to the Pontifex Maximus' record, but to the *commentarii* of the pontifical college.[4]

None of these passages in Livy and Dionysius suggest that these writers had any direct acquaintance with the Pontifex Maximus' record. The same is also true of Quintilian's observation in relation to its style (T6), which may be based on those of Cicero, and probably of Aulus Gellius' citation (F6), which he is likely to have taken from the other source he names, the Augustan antiquarian Verrius Flaccus.[5]

Our other references to the record are the product of the erudition, real or pretended, of late antiquity (T3, 7–12, F1–4). Servius Danielis' information about the record (T3) and the other material in the Servian note of which it forms part almost certainly derives from the earlier Virgil commentary by Donatus. The note seeks (implausibly) to explain Virgil's use of the word *annales* at *Aen.* 1.373 as intended to represent Aeneas as a *pontifex*. The same point is made by Macrobius (T9), no doubt also following Donatus. Donatus probably took at least some of the information deployed in his commentary on this passage from Verrius Flaccus' treatise *De significatu uerborum*, as is shown by Aulus Gellius' citation of that work (5.18) for views on the distinction between *annales* and *historia* similar to the opening section of the Servian note, and by the fact that the derivation of *Annales Maximi* from Pontifex Maximus, given by both Servius Danielis and Macrobius, also appeared in Festus' abbreviation of Verrius' work (T12). It is thus plausible to suppose, as Frier has argued, that the rest of Servius Danielis' information on the Pontifex Maximus'

[2] See at nn. 27, 34, and commentary on F12.

[3] On T5 see n. 51.

[4] See below and commentary on F7–10. Dionysius' reference to 'secret and sacred books' at 11.62.3 clearly relates to the *libri linei* used as a source by Licinius Macer (cf. Macer 27 F18, with commentary).

[5] On F6 see further at nn. 53–4 and commentary.

record also derives, through Donatus, from Verrius Flaccus. However, the point should not be regarded as conclusively established.[6]

Verrius Flaccus has also been proposed as the source for the citations of the *Annales Maximi* (F1–3) and numerous other writers in the *Origo Gentis Romanae*. However, this remains conjectural.[7]

1. The character of the Pontifex Maximus' record

The following facts about the record are undisputed: the Pontifex Maximus displayed a record of the notable events of each year on a whitewashed wooden board (*album*, *tabula dealbata*: T2, 3), and this record was somehow preserved in permanent form; the events recorded included eclipses and corn shortages (T1, F5); the practice ceased with P. Mucius Scaevola, Pontifex Maximus from 130 to *c.*115 BC (T3).[8] Virtually everything else is uncertain.

The sources say that the board was displayed at the Pontifex Maximus' house (T1–3, 5). The Pontifex Maximus resided at the Domus Publica, but the usual view that it was located not there, but at the adjacent Regia may nonetheless be correct. The Regia was heavily damaged by fire in 210, 148, and shortly before 36 BC; we are not told whether records were lost in these conflagrations.[9]

According to Servius Danielis (T3), the annual record opened with the names of the magistrates, and the year's events were then noted in the order of their occurrence 'day by day' (*per singulos dies*). Events were probably entered on the board as they occurred. Cicero (T2) has sometimes been taken to imply that the board was only set up at the end of each year, with the full record of the year's events already entered, but his wording need not bear that construction.[10]

According to these passages of Cicero and Servius Danielis, the information displayed on the board comprised comprehensive coverage of the year's events. This conception reflects the belief that it was intended as a historical record, asserted by Cicero (T2) and later sources (T8, 9). In fact, the board must have been posted to inform the Roman people of recent events, and the coverage is likely to have been more restricted than these sources suggest, although in later years it may have become fuller. As many scholars have supposed, the initial focus may well have been primarily, and perhaps even exclusively, on events which had some religious significance that brought them within the (admittedly wide-ranging) concerns of the pontifical college.

[6] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 27–37. As Frier observes, much of the material in the Servian note is also found at Isid. *orig.* 1.41.1, 44.1–4 (although without explicit reference to the *Annales Maximi* in the surviving text), but Isidore must here be following Donatus rather than, as Frier supposes, consulting Verrius Flaccus directly.

[7] See further above, I. 99. For identification of Verrius Flaccus as the main source of the *OGR* see especially P. L. Schmidt, *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1611–33; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 41–8; M. Schlmeyer, *Origo Gentis Romanae: Die Ursprünge des römischen Volkes* (Darmstadt, 2004), 119–26.

[8] Scaevola's predecessor died in 130 and his successor is known to have been in post in 114 (*MRR* 1. 503, 532, 534; Rüpke, *Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 804–5, no. 2476).

[9] Bucher (*AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 36–40) argues that the record was kept at the Regia and destroyed in the last of these fires. For the fires see Livy 26.27.3; Obseq. 19; Livy, *Oxy epit.* 50; Dio 48.42. Frier (*Libri Annales*, 87–8; 2nd edn., xiv) maintains that the record was kept at the Domus Publica.

[10] Cf. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 89–90; *contra* Meyer, *Legitimacy and Law* (2004), 31.

Prodigies in particular are likely to be among the categories of events recorded, and the story of Horatius Cocles' statue provides confirmation if it derives from one of the notices recorded on the board (F6; see further below). However, there is no good reason to regard the record as simply a listing of prodigies.[11]

What purpose the posting of the board was intended to serve remains uncertain. People would not have needed an official bulletin to tell them of at least some of the types of events which were recorded, since everyone would know that there had been an eclipse or that corn was scarce, and it remains unclear what ritual purpose may have been served by such publication.[12]

Scholars have often associated the Pontifex Maximus' annual record with the pontifical college's responsibility for the calendar. Mommsen conjectured that the record originated in the appending of notes of events against years in a magistrate list, which he held that the *pontifices* maintained along with the calendar, and that in time this evolved into a regular practice of recording events.[13] Seeck suggested instead that in its original form the record comprised notes of events added against the date of their occurrence in a published annual calendar, and this theory has won wide acceptance.[14] However, these speculations should be rejected. The publication of the calendar is itself an obscure and controversial topic: although Cicero (*Att.* 6.1.8) may suggest that the *decemviri* published the calendar, the sources' main reference to written calendar publication in the early centuries concerns the aedile Cn. Flavius, who in 304 is said to have made available calendar information which the *pontifices* had been withholding.[15] In any case, the sources offer no support for the view that the Pontifex Maximus' record originated as annotations to a document of a different kind, such as a calendar or magistrate list, but characterize it clearly as a free-standing list of the year's events.[16]

Like other priestly colleges, the *pontifices* maintained an archive, known as their books (*libri*) or *commentarii*, in which they recorded their proceedings and other ritual

[11] Richardson, in Richardson and Santangelo (eds.), *Priests and State in the Roman World* (2011), 91–106, shows that the trial and punishment of Vestals is one category of event likely to have been omitted from the record.

[12] Scheid, *Convegno S. Mazzarino* (1998), 199–220, suggests that the Pontifex Maximus' record was a compilation of prodigies and other developments of religious significance awaiting consideration by the senate at the start of the magistrate year, but this does not explain its public display. Rüpke's view (*Klio* 75 (1993), 173=*Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 34) that the notices were warnings of forthcoming events is both intrinsically implausible and in contradiction with all the evidence.

[13] Mommsen, *Hist. Rome* 1. 475–8; *Chron.*[2], 209–14. Huebner, *NJPhP* 79 (1859), 401–23, follows and in some respects develops Mommsen's views on the record.

[14] Seeck, *Kalendertafel* (1885), 61–4. Accepted by e.g. Cichorius, *RE* 1. 2249–51; Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), 61–4; Drummond, *CAH*[2] 7.2. 20; Petzold, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtschreibung* (1999), 258–9; Forsythe, *Piso*, 61, *Critical History* (2005), 70; Beck–Walter 1, 34; Walter, *Memoria und res publica* (2004), 198. Petzold and Forsythe draw a parallel with the medieval monastic chronicles which evolved from annotations to Easter calendars, a point already made by Mommsen.

[15] On the publication of the calendar see Michels, *Calendar*, 108–18; Rüpke, *Kalender*, 245 ff.; Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 610–13.

[16] Against the calendar theory of the record's origins see W. Soltau, *Philologus* 5 (1896), 258–9; Peter 1. viii–ix; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 91. Further objections are that, as Soltau observed, there was no need for a new publication of the calendar each year, and that the magistrate year, by which the record was organized, did not coincide with the calendar year until the consuls' entry into office was changed to 1 January in 153 BC (this difficulty is not adequately dealt with by Seeck, *Kalendertafel* (1885), 64).

matters.[17] Even in antiquity there was some confusion between this archive and the Pontifex Maximus' annual record: thus, although Horace's reference to the 'books of the Pontifices' must relate to the college archive, the scholiast Porphyrio thought that the *Annales Maximi* might be meant (T7). For a number of texts scholars have disputed which record is meant.[18] A good many events (prodigies, for example) no doubt figured both on the board displayed to the public by the Pontifex Maximus and in the *commentarii* of the *pontifices*, and the Pontifex Maximus may sometimes have drawn on these *commentarii* in composing his entries for the board. However, the two records will have served different purposes, and the entries on the board will not have been mere extracts from the *commentarii*, as Rüpke has maintained.[19]

The entries will have been made on the whitewashed board with black ink. This method was used because it was the normal means of putting information on public display at Rome and because new entries could be added easily.[20] It is usually supposed that the information on the board only related to the current year, and that either a new board was set up every year or the old board was wiped clean or repainted and reused. However, the only evidence for this assumption is Servius Danielis' use of the word *quotannis* ('every year'), and, even if this is what the passage implies, the writer may not have been accurately informed on the point. The board may well have carried entries for several years, and, when a board was filled and a new one started, the old one may not have been immediately removed.[21]

Whitewashed boards were not durable enough for permanent record-keeping, and it is absurd to suppose, as some scholars have done, that boards with earlier years' records were retained in storage in the Regia. Thus the entries must also have been recorded in some more permanent form. This could have happened at a later point, for example at the end of each year, but it is perhaps more likely to have taken place when the entries were made. For what it is worth, this may be what is implied by Cicero's statement (T2) that 'the Pontifex Maximus used to commit to writing all the affairs of each year, copy them out on a white board, and display the tablet at his home' (*res omnis singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus efferebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi*), where the exporting of the information to the whitewashed board seems to follow its being initially put into writing. This is certainly what is conveyed by the closely parallel language used by Livy in reporting

[17] For the *commentarii* and other records of the *pontifices* see A. von Premerstein, *RE* 4, 729–31; G. Rohde, *Die Kultsatzungen der römischen Pontifices* (Berlin, 1936); F. Sini, *Documenti sacerdotali di Roma antica*. I: *Libri e commentarii* (Sassari, 1983); J. Scheid, in *La Mémoire perdue. A la recherche des archives oubliées, publiques et privées, de la Rome antique* (Paris, 1994), 173–85; J. A. North, in *La Mémoire perdue. Recherches sur l'administration romaine* (Rome, 1998), 45–63; Vaahtera, *Hermes* 130 (2002), 100–8.

[18] See below and commentary on F10. The early study of Hulleman, *Disputatio* (1855), 1–19, provides a careful discrimination between the Pontifex Maximus' record and the *commentarii pontificum*.

[19] Rupke, *Klio* 75 (1993), 170–6 (=*Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 33–6); followed by Scheid, *Convegno S. Mazzarino* (1998), 199–220; see further n. 22. On the view that material from the *commentarii pontificum* was included in the eighty-book version of the *Annales Maximi* see at n. 48.

[20] Bucher, *AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 21–4. Bucher's article gives a valuable survey of record-keeping in republican Rome, on which see also E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 160–85; P. Culham, *CPh* 84 (1989), 100–15; Engels, *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen* (2007), 87–92.

[21] References to a single *tabula* in the sources (T1–3, 5) do not show that only one board was on display. The reference may be just to the board in current use, and the singular form *tabula* was in any case sometimes used of an inscription extending over several boards (Bucher, *AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 23–4 and n. 65).

Ancus Marcius' legendary publication of Numa's religious enactments, according to which Ancus 'ordered the Pontifex to copy them all out from the royal records onto a white board and display them in public' (*omnia ea ex commentariis regiis pontificem in album elata proponere in publico iubet*).[22]

The permanent record was probably kept on wax tablets bound in *codices*.[23] This method was used in republican Rome for some other substantial archives, such as the senate's decrees, and so would have been natural for the purpose.[24] Each entry may have been originally composed on a wax tablet and then written up on the white board by a sign-writer, with the wax tablet then retained as the permanent record.[25]

Bucher (*AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 29–38) has proposed a more complex procedure, by which the entries were initially composed on a wax tablet, then copied for temporary display onto the whitewashed board, and finally transferred for permanent record onto a bronze tablet, which was retained on public display. However, the postulated final stage of a permanent display on bronze is unnecessary and implausible (not least because of the unsuitability of bronze for information which would require annual updating). Bucher adduces Cicero's language in support of his view, arguing that each of the three limbs of Cicero's sentence represents a different part of the recording process. However, while, as argued above, *mandabat litteris* may well imply initial composition on wax, the rest of the sentence is naturally taken as referring just to the copying out of the entries on the white board and its display. All the references to a 'tablet' (*tabula*, *πίναξ*) in our sources (T1–3, 5) surely refer to the publicly displayed whitewashed board.[26]

The Pontifex Maximus' record for past years may sometimes have been consulted for precedents. Two passages of Livy which speak of precedents being sought from *annales* at a period before the composition of the first literary histories (T 15, F12)

[22] Livy 1.32.2; cf. DH 3.36.4. The close parallel between the Cicero and Livy passages is rightly stressed by Rüpke (*Klio* 75 (1993), 173–4=*Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 35), but it does not support his interpretation of the Pontifex Maximus' record as extracted from the *commentarii* of the *pontifices*: Ancus is said to have put on display information from *commentarii* composed long before (by Numa), whereas Cicero represents the Pontifex Maximus as committing his records to writing and putting them on display at the same time.

[23] So first Kornemann (*Klio* 11 (1911), 245–57) (but see n. 26).

[24] Archival use of wax tablets: Kornemann, *RE* 2A,1957–62; Posner, Culham, cited n. 20; Meyer, *Legitimacy and Law* (2004), 24–43. Senate decrees: A. O'Brien-Moore, *RE* 6A. 805–6; Sherk, *RDGE* 8–10. Bucher's claim (*AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 24–6) that wax tablets were too bulky to accommodate a large archive fails to take account of their use for senate decrees. He bases his calculations on the surviving wax tablets from the house of Jucundus at Pompeii, but larger tablets were probably used for archival purposes (cf. W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), 194).

[25] An alternative possibility for the permanent form of the Pontifex Maximus' record is papyrus rolls (*libri*): these were in use at Rome from quite early times, and Servius Danielis' speaks of the record being transferred into *libri* (T3; see further below). References to *libri pontificum* (Festus 204; Serv. *georg.* 1.272, *Aen.* 12.603) suggest that at least part of the archive of the pontifical college was preserved on papyrus, and Cicero's reference to a *liber* containing *senatus consulta* (*Att.* 13.33.3) may indicate that the record of senate decrees was at some point transferred to this medium. Claims that papyrus rolls were not used for archival purposes under the republic (E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 161–2; Bucher, *AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 27–8) disregard this evidence. Yet another possibility is that, at least at first, linen rolls were used for the permanent form of the record, as suggested by Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome*, 267 n. 146.

[26] In claiming that our sources' references to a *tabula* or *πίναξ* sometimes refer to something other than the publicly displayed whitewashed board, Bucher is following Kornemann (cited n. 23), who (without citing any parallels for such a usage) argued that at T1–2, 5 these terms refer to a stored *codex* of wax tablets containing the permanent record.

may imply such consultation. However, Livy is unlikely to have had good authority for these statements, and may indeed have been writing anachronistically, with just literary histories in mind.[27]

By the later second century the availability of other records and written histories had made the Pontifex Maximus' record redundant. Cicero's statement (T2) that the record was kept until P. Mucius Scaevola was Pontifex Maximus is usually taken to mean that Scaevola stopped making the entries at some point during his term of office. This may well be correct, but it is also possible that the record was stopped by his successor on entry into office.[28]

2. *The inception of the Pontifex Maximus' record*

While Cicero gives us firm evidence about when the Pontifex Maximus' record was terminated, its inception has been the subject of protracted controversy. The sources provide little direct evidence. Servius Danielis (T3) describes it in terms implying republican institutions, with the annual entries headed by the names of the magistrates. Cicero (T2) surprisingly speaks of the record as having been kept 'from the beginning of Roman affairs' (*ab initio rerum Romanarum*). He has sometimes been thought to have been writing loosely, but he will hardly have expressed himself in this way if he envisaged the practice as not instituted until after the establishment of the republic. Some further sources, to be considered below, imply that the record went back to the earliest times.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the *Annales Maximi* figured in the lively controversy over the credibility of early Roman history. Conservatives like Vossius, Ryckius, Perizonius, Sallier, and Hooke, who wished to defend the traditional account from Aeneas and Romulus on, cited the *Annales Maximi* as one of the sources by which reliable information could have been preserved. Sceptics like Cluver, Dodwell, Pouilly, and Beaufort insisted that these records could not have survived the Gallic Sack. The sceptics stressed the testimony of Livy and Plutarch for the destruction of records in the Sack (T14; Plut. *Num.* 1.2=Clodius 16 F1). Their opponents took comfort from the fact that Livy (T14a) stated only that 'most' (*pleraeque*) records were destroyed, not all.[29]

The discovery in 1819 of much of Cicero's *De re publica* on a Vatican palimpsest brought an important new piece of evidence to the debate, namely Cicero's statement (put into the mouth of Scipio) that both Ennius and the *Annales Maximi* mentioned a solar eclipse which took place on the Nones of June in about the 350th year after the foundation of Rome, and that this information had been used to calculate the date of earlier eclipses back to Romulus' death (F5). The eclipse is thus dated by implication

[27] Both F15 and F12 imply a contrast between remote events attested by *annales* and the memories of those still living: see further commentary on F12, and cf. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 98–100, 119.

[28] Rightly noted by Bucher, *AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 6.

[29] On this debate see H. J. Erasmus, *The Origins of Rome in Historiography from Petrarch to Perizonius* (Assen, 1962), esp. 63–8, 76–81, 92, 109–12, 127–8; M. Raskolnikoff, *Histoire romaine et critique historique dans l'Europe des lumières* (Strasburg, 1992); C. Grell, *Histoire économie société* 2 (1983), 255–80, and *Le Dix-huitième siècle et l'antiquité en France, 1680–1789* (Oxford, 1995), 826–51.

to approximately fifteen years before the Gallic Sack.[30] A solar eclipse visible at Rome on 21 June 400 BC has commonly been identified as the one referred to (see further commentary on F5). The passage thus offers prima facie evidence that some entries from the Pontifex Maximus' record survived the Sack. Nonetheless, soon after its discovery Niebuhr and Becker interpreted the passage as confirming the destruction of the record in the Sack, and this line of argument has been widely adopted in subsequent scholarship. Cicero's statement about the calculation of earlier eclipses is taken to show that no earlier notices of eclipses appeared in the surviving *Annales Maximi*, and the notice of this eclipse and other recent notices are held to have been reconstructed from memory after the Gauls' withdrawal. The conclusion is thus drawn that genuine entries from the record survived only from about 400 BC.[31]

This view may be too pessimistic. As is now generally accepted, the keeping of the Pontifex Maximus' record cannot antedate the republic.[32] However, the practice could well have been established by the early or middle fifth century BC, and, if so, authentic entries may have survived to later times.[33] Parallels exist for the display of written information from this period, notably the Twelve Tables, and this confirms that literacy was sufficiently widespread to support such publication. Some elements in Livy's and Dionysius' accounts of the fifth century may be plausibly interpreted as deriving ultimately from the Pontifex Maximus' record (see section 4). Cicero's language at F5 need not imply that no earlier eclipse was mentioned in the preserved record. The lack of any archaeological trace of the Gallic Sack suggests that destruction was a good deal less extensive than the literary sources claim. Their statements about the destruction of records may not have rested on sound information, and in any case are not explicitly directed to the Pontifex Maximus' record: Clodius 16 F1 relates to genealogies (see commentary ad loc.); Livy's mention, at 6.1.2 (T14a), of losses from the *commentarii pontificum* has often been taken as applying to the Pontifex Maximus' record, but, in view of his subsequent statement (6.1.10) that the *pontifices* prevented the publication of recovered material relating to their *sacra*, the reference is surely rather to the archive of the pontifical college.[34]

Several scholars have, however, argued that the Pontifex Maximus' record did not begin to be kept until the third century BC. Soltau and Beloch date the record's inception *c.*300 and associate it with the admission of plebeians to the pontificate by

[30] Polybius, whose chronology Cicero followed in the *De re publica* (see 2.18.2), dated the Sack to the 364th year after the foundation (Pol. 1.6.2, 6.11a.2=DH 1.74.3). Others dated it to the 363rd (Cassius Hemina 6 F 23) or 365th year (Livy 5.54.5), while Dionysius envisaged the period as 360 years (1.74–5). See Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 100–4.

[31] For such views see e.g. Niebuhr, *Hist. Rome* 1. 247–8, *Lectures*[3] (1870), 5–6; Becker, *Handbuch* 1 (1843), 7–8; Schwegler, *RG* 1. 9–10; Lewis, *Inquiry* (1855), 1. 158–61; Seeck, *Kalendertafel* (1885), 74–5; Cichorius, *RE* 1. 2252; Enmann, *RhM* 57 (1902), 520–1; Westrup, *Antiquarian-Historiographical Activities* (1929), 39–40; Crake, *CPh* 35 (1940), 379–80; Petzold, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtschreibung* (1999), 191.

[32] An isolated exception is E. Peruzzi, *Origini di Roma* 2 (Bologna, 1973), 175–207, dating the inception of the chronicle to the reign of Numa.

[33] Scholars who hold that the Pontifex Maximus' record began to be kept in the fifth century and that authentic fifth-century entries survived to later times include Ogilvie, *Comm.* 6 n. 1; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 115–35; Cornell, in M. Beard *et al.* (eds.), *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1991), 31–2, and *Beginnings*, 14, 318; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 25, 381–2, and *Comm.* 4. 480, 507.

[34] So too the reference at Livy 4.3.9, in the speech of the tribune Canuleius, to denial of plebeian access to the *commentarii pontificum* must relate to the college archive.

the Ogulnian rogation, while Nitzsch and Rüpke hold that the record was begun in 249 by Ti. Coruncanius, the first plebeian Pontifex Maximus.[35] However, if the record had begun so late, some memory of its inception is likely to have survived in the tradition, and the grounds advanced for such late datings are not cogent.

Soltau and Beloch emend F5 to date the eclipse to the third century, but there is no good reason to depart from the transmitted text: see further the commentary on this fragment.

The main argument adduced for the low datings for the record's inception relates to changes in the pattern of the surviving evidence. It is true that there is an increase in routine domestic information likely to derive from archival sources in Livy's narrative for the early third century. His surviving narrative breaks off at the end of 293, and after its resumption in 218 such routine information is much fuller, and includes regular reports on, among much else, prodigies and their procuration and the deaths and appointments of priests. Moreover, the starting point of Obsequens' treatise on Roman prodigies (for which Livy was the source) is often taken to show that prodigies were not regularly recorded until 249 (a view first proposed by Mommsen and Bernays).[36]

However, other explanations are available for these changes in the surviving accounts, and to attribute them to a postulated late inception of the Pontifex Maximus' record is neither necessary nor cogent.[37] Information which may derive from archival sources, including notices relating to prodigies and priests, does occur in the tradition on the fifth and fourth centuries. It may well be that the level of detail recorded by the Pontifex Maximus increased over time, and this may be one reason why more such material occurs in the surviving tradition from *c.*300 on. In any case, other archival sources will also have been drawn on by the writers from whom Livy derives, notably the record of senate decrees, and the increased density of routine domestic information may reflect the greater availability of information in such sources. The authorial choices both of his predecessors and of Livy himself will also have played a part. As for Obsequens, the information that his work began in 249 derives solely from the title given to it in the *editio princeps* of 1508, and the surviving portion, for which that edition is the only source, starts in 190. If Obsequens did begin in 249, it was probably because he only had access to Livy's text from that point, since Livy's earlier prodigy notices would have been as suitable for his purpose as those he uses.[38]

[35] K. W. Nitzsch, *Die römische Annalistik* (Berlin, 1873), 238–40, 264; Soltau, *Philologus* 40 (1896), 257–76, and *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtschreibung* (1909), 10–16; Beloch, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 119–33, and *RG* 86–95; Rüpke, *Klio* 75 (1993), 155–79, and *Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 24–38. Beloch dated the inception of the record to 296, since he held that the Ogulnii passed their law during their curule aedileship in that year rather than as tribunes in 300; against this view see Oakley, *Comm.* 4. 84 n. 1, 481. A prominent role was assigned to Coruncanius also by Enmann; however, whereas Nitzsch and Rüpke credit him with the inception of the record, in Enmann's view he expanded and backdated an already existing record (see at n. 44).

[36] Mommsen, in O. Jahn, *T. Livi . . . periochae, Iulii Obsequentis . . . prodigiorum liber* (Leipzig, 1853), p. xx (=*Ges. Schr.* 7, 169); J. Bernays, *RhM* 12 (1857), 436–8.

[37] See further sect. 4, and Crake, *CPh* 35 (1940), 380–1; Oakley, *Comm.* 4. 480–2, 487; Engels, *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen* (2007), 62–4. As Oakley notes, Beloch's claim that the *Fasti Triumphales* only become reliable after 295 is unfounded.

[38] So rightly Seeck, *Kalendertafel* (1885), 67; Wülker, *Prodigienwesen* (1903), 56–61; Engels, *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen* (2007), 63.

There is thus no good reason to adopt a late dating for the inception of the Pontifex Maximus' record. The record may have begun to be kept during and perhaps early in the fifth century, and some entries may have survived from that period and been used by later historians. Cicero's citation of the *Annales Maximi* for the eclipse (F5) in all probability derives from an authentic entry made by the Pontifex Maximus of the day and accordingly shows that the record was displayed and kept at least from *c.*400 and that entries survived from that time.[39]

3. *Expansion, publication, and the eighty-book version*

Servius Danielis (T3) tells us that 'men of a former time put the annual records into eighty books'. The surviving fragments with book numbers (F1–3, 6) must, if genuine, come from this version. Mommsen combined Servius Danielis' statement with Cicero's information (T2) that the record continued to be kept until the pontificate of Scaevola, and concluded that Scaevola not only stopped keeping the record but also published it in eighty books.[40] Most subsequent discussions have taken this assumption for granted. It has, however, been challenged by Frier, who holds that the eighty-book version was published under Augustus.[41] Others have noted that no source expressly mentions publication, and hold that the eighty-book version may simply have existed as a single copy in the archive of the Pontifex Maximus.[42]

A related question is that of the character of the eighty-book version. Some scholars hold that it comprised simply the annual entries made by the Pontifices Maximi.[43] Most, however, suppose that, although it incorporated material from the annual entries, this had been greatly expanded with other material to form a history extending back to the origins of Rome, but divergent views are held as to when this expansion took place.

In the older scholarship one very influential doctrine was that the record had been first expanded by the Pontifices to include the early history at a time before the inception of literary historiography at Rome. This view originated with Mommsen, who dated this initial expansion to the later fourth century BC and dubbed the resulting version the *Liber Annalis*. Mommsen's doctrine was greatly elaborated by Enmann, who credited the expansion to Ti. Coruncanius, Pontifex Maximus from *c.*254 to 243 and the first plebeian to hold the office, and by Kornemann, who

[39] See further commentary on F5. Yet another view held by some scholars is that the Pontifex Maximus initially kept a private record of events and only subsequently, *c.*300, changed to putting some of this record on public display on the whitewashed board: so Hulleman, *Disputatio* (1855), 33 ff.; Cantarelli, *RFIC* 26 (1898), 209–29; De Sanctis, *SR* 1. 16–21. Cicero's language at T2 gives no support for this hypothesis (so rightly Niemeyer, *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 12 (1858), 423, against Hulleman), and, although the tradition insists on the Pontifices' secrecy about their sacral lore in the fifth and fourth centuries, that is not incompatible with the Pontifex Maximus' display of a record of events.

[40] Mommsen, *Hist. Rome* 3. 469.

[41] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 179–200.

[42] Seeck, *Kalendertafel* (1885), 83–99; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 15; Cornell, 'Formation', 71–2; Drews, *CPh* 83 (1988), 289–99 (arguing that the single copy was lost in the first half of the first century BC); Forsythe, *Piso*, 66, 'The Roman historians' (2000), 7–8, and *Critical History* (2005), 71. Drews's theory that Valerius Antias was the intermediary for the fragments with cited book numbers overlooks the fact that this mode of citation was characteristic not of historical writers, but of antiquarians.

[43] So Cichorius, *RE* 1. 2251–5; Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), 61; Cornell, 'Formation', 71–2.

distinguished three stages in the process of expansion.[44] However, the theory that such a chronicle was constructed well before Fabius Pictor wrote the first known history of Rome is unsubstantiated and implausible and has now rightly been generally abandoned.[45]

Those who hold that the eighty-book version was an expansion now envisage it as a work compiled at some point after Fabius began Roman historical writing, in which material from the annual records was bulked out by the addition of antiquarian and anecdotal matter, and coverage was extended back to the beginnings of Rome. Most scholars who take this view suppose that the work was given this form either during Scaevola's term of office or under him and his immediate predecessors.[46] However, Frier has made a powerful case for dating the development instead to the reign of Augustus.[47]

There are three main obstacles to the view that the eighty-book version comprised just the authentic annual entries made by the Pontifices Maximi: the number of the books; allusions in Cicero and perhaps also Dionysius to the record as covering the early history of Rome; and the character of most of the fragments ascribed to the record.

If the eighty books were papyrus rolls, this version of the *Annales Maximi* treated Roman history on a more ample scale than almost all of the known literary histories. Livy covered the whole history of Rome down to 120 BC in sixty-one books, and among his predecessors only Cn. Gellius apparently wrote at greater length. The annual entries made by the Pontifices Maximi during the period in which the record was maintained cannot possibly have filled eighty papyrus rolls. We must either accept that in the eighty-book version the record had been expanded on a very ample scale or find some other explanation of the number of books. Cichorius (n. 43), who accepted Seeck's view that the notices were appended to a published calendar, suggested that the eighty books included the full calendar for each year; but, as noted above, the calendrical theory of the origins of the pontifical record is questionable, and it seems most unlikely that a series of calendars would have been transcribed in this way. Another possibility entertained by some scholars is that the eighty books included not just the annual record kept by the Pontifex Maximus, but also materials from the archive of the pontifical college.[48] Another solution which may be worth considering is that the word *liber* was being used loosely or erroneously and that the eighty 'books' were in fact not papyrus rolls but *codices* of wax tablets, which would have held much less matter.[49]

[44] Mommsen, *Hist. Rome* 1. 479–80; Enmann, *RhM* 57 (1902), 517–33; Kornemann, *Klio* 11 (1911), 245–57, 335–42, and *Priestercodex* (1912). These writers are followed by e.g. Soltau, *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* 17 (1914/5), 321–42, and Westrup, *Antiquarian-Historiographical Activities* (1929), 37–40. For the wider influence of this view see the works cited by Frier, *Libri Annales*, 169 n. 14.

[45] For criticisms of the theory see Crake, *CPh* 35 (1940), 375–86; Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), 60–6; Perl, *F&F* 38 (1964), 185–9, 213–18; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 11–14, 165–74; Oakley, *Comm.* 4. 483–4.

[46] So Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria', 150–4; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 15; Petzold, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtschreibung* (1999), 184–221, 252–65; Rüpke, *Klio* 75 (1993), 176–8, and *Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 36–7; Forsythe, *Piso*, 53–73, and 'The Roman historians' (2000), 6.

[47] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 179–200.

[48] So e.g. De Sanctis, *SR* 1. 21; Westrup, *Antiquarian-Historiographical Activities* (1929), 42–5. Further bibliography at Frier, *Libri Annales*, 167 n. 11. For the pontifical archive see n. 17.

[49] Cf. Forsythe, cited n. 42.

Two passages in Cicero imply that the Pontifex Maximus' record went back to the kings. In his account of the record in the *De oratore* (T2), Cicero makes Antonius state that it was kept 'from the beginning of Roman affairs', and, as noted above, this can hardly be dismissed as merely loose writing. In the *De re publica*, Manilius, asking about the tradition of Numa's Pythagoreanism, is made to observe that 'it does not appear to be adequately supported by the authority of the public annals' (T13). The implication is that these 'public annals' (*annales publici*) included an account of Numa's reign, but without mention of Pythagoreanism. The reference seems likely to be to the Pontifex Maximus' record rather than to literary annals, not least because histories composed by or around 129, the dramatic date of the *De re publica*, asserted Numa's Pythagoreanism.[50]

In two passages, reproduced here as doubtful fragments (F7–8), Dionysius claims that variant accounts of respectively the founders of Rome and the birth of Servius Tullius given by unnamed Roman writers derive from an archival source. The reference may be to the Pontifex Maximus' record, but, as already noted (at n. 4), these assertions may be based just on a theory about early historians' sources and Dionysius may not have had any particular archive in mind.

In his discussion of the foundation date of Rome (1.74–5), Dionysius insists that it is not enough to assert a date without argument, as Polybius did, or 'to accept without examination the authority of the single and unique tablet kept by the Pontifices Maximi' (T5). The reference must be to the whitewashed board displayed by the Pontifex Maximus. It would seem that an unnamed writer based his foundation date on the tablet, but what indication it can have provided for the foundation remains unclear. It does not follow that the unnamed writer was referring to a version of the Pontifex Maximus' record which had been extended back to the regal period. It is possible that, in the final years before Scaevola stopped the display of the whitewashed board, the yearly notices had come to be prefaced not only by the names of the magistrates, but also by a dating from the foundation of the city.[51]

Four passages purport to cite the pontifical record for pre-republican events (F1–4). The citation in the *Historia Augusta* (F4) is likely to be a fabrication. The other three (F1–3) are all from the *Origo Gentis Romanae* and cite the fourth book of the pontifical annals for incidents relating to kings of Alba from Ascanius to Aremulus Silvius. If these are genuine citations from the eighty-book version, it had not even reached the foundation of Rome by the fourth book, and its anecdotal and antiquarian character is established beyond doubt. It would follow also that the compilers of this

[50] Pliny, *nat.* 13.84–7=Cassius Hemina 6 F35, Piso 9 F15. On T13 see Frier, *Libri Annales*, 107–8; Bucher, *AJAH* 12 (1987 (1995)), 40–1.

[51] On the problems posed by T5 see esp. Walbank, *Comm.* 1. 665–6; T. Steinby, *Arctos* 2 (1958), 143–51; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 111–14. The reference to the Pontifices Maximi depends on an emendation by Niebuhr (*Hist. Rome* 1. 239 n. 656), unconvincingly disputed by Schwegler (*RG* 1. 8 n. 4): although it is a difficulty that Dionysius nowhere else uses the term ἀρχιερεύς for this priest, no alternative seems viable. Dionysius cannot mean that Polybius appealed to the authority of the tablet, as has often been supposed, for he criticizes Polybius for not giving any reason for his date. It is most unlikely that the reference is not to the whitewashed board, but to a different tablet kept by the Pontifices Maximi, as supposed by Leuze, *Jahrzählung*, 157 n. 103, 107–8 (identifying it as a list of eponymous magistrates), and by Steinby. On the view of Kornemann and Bucher that the reference is not to the whitewashed board but to the permanent form of the annual record, see n. 26.

version drew on the established Roman historiographical tradition from Fabius on, since it must have been in this tradition that the Alban king list and further information about the kings was elaborated to bridge the perceived gap between Aeneas and Romulus. In older scholarship these passages were disregarded, in accordance with the then prevailing dismissal of the *OGR* itself as a forgery. In fact, as is now generally recognized, the *OGR* is a genuine work of late antiquity, and its citations may be authentic. As Frier has argued, they may have been drawn from Verrius Flaccus.[52] Most recent discussions have accepted the authenticity of F1–3 as citations from the eighty-book version as established. This is overconfident: the possibility remains open that these, and some of the other citations in the *OGR*, were fabricated by its late-imperial author.

Aulus Gellius reports the story of the statue of Horatius Cocles from the eleventh book of the *Annales Maximi* (F6) and the first book of Verrius Flaccus' *Memorable Facts* (*Res memoria dignae*). As has long been observed, at least the opening words of Gellius' account, reporting the lightning strike and the summoning of *haruspices*, may derive ultimately from an authentic contemporary entry in the record made by the Pontifex Maximus. However, of the rest at any rate the verse allegedly sung by the boys cannot derive from such an entry: in view of the close similarity with the Hesiod line, it is probably an anachronism, and in any case such expansive and anecdotal material cannot have been included in the Pontifex Maximus' notice. Gellius' language implies that the whole story including the verse was in the *Annales Maximi* (*ea historia de aruspicibus et de uersu isto senario scripta est in annalibus maximis* ...). If this is correct, the literary and anecdotal character of the eighty-book version is confirmed. Doubts have, however, been raised about the reliability of Gellius' information. Nineteenth-century studies of his use of his sources concluded that it was his practice only to consult his last-named source directly, and on this basis Cichorius conjectured that only the first few sentences of the story had stood in the *Annales Maximi* and the rest had been added by Verrius Flaccus.[53] Although Gellius was probably more scrupulous in consulting his sources directly than his nineteenth-century critics allowed, in view of the later obscurity of the *Annales Maximi* it is likely enough that he only consulted this work indirectly.[54]

Further evidence for the eighty-book version as expanded with legendary material will be provided by Dionysius' account of the speaking statue of Fortuna Muliebris, if its source, which he characterizes as 'the writings of the Pontifices', is to be identified with the Pontifex Maximus' record (F10). However, the reference is more likely to be to the *commentarii* of the pontifical college. (See further commentary on F10.)

The above considerations do not exclude the possibility that the eighty-book version comprised just the annual records made by the Pontifices Maximi. However, adopting that hypothesis requires a very radical treatment of the sources: the high number of books must be explained away; the apparent implication of Cicero's (and perhaps also Dionysius') statements that the Pontifex Maximus' record went back to

[52] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 41–5; see further General Introduction.

[53] L. Mercklin, *JKPh* Suppl. 3 (1860), 633–712, esp. 650–1; Cichorius, *RE* 1. 2253. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 40, 58, accepts that Gellius did not consult the *Annales Maximi* directly, but unwarrantedly insists that Verrius Flaccus must have vouched that the whole story stood in that work.

[54] Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 72–80, 247.

the regal period must be disregarded; and F1–4 and most of F6 must be rejected as fragments of the eighty-book *Annales Maximi*.

The alternative is to accept that the eighty-book version comprised an ample account of Roman history from legendary times which had the anecdotal and antiquarian character implied by F1–4, 6. This view too is not free from difficulties. Why, instead of claiming the credit for authorship, should the compiler(s) of so ambitious a work have sought to pass it off as the Pontifex Maximus' record, although its character was patently altogether unlike that of the genuine chronicle? Why has so little trace survived of what will have constituted one of the most extensive Roman histories composed in antiquity?

Cicero's statements do not fully support this hypothesis, whichever view is taken of when the supposed expanded version was composed. If it had been composed by the later second century BC, Cicero's references may be understood as envisaging this expanded version of the Pontifex Maximus' record, which could explain his apparent assumption that it went back to the regal period, but his insistence on its thinness (T2, 4) then becomes hard to understand. On Frier's view that the expanded version was composed under Augustus, Cicero's references will have been just to the authentic record compiled by the Pontifices Maximi. In that case, we can readily comprehend his insistence on the thinness of the record, but not his assumption that it included the earliest times.[55]

It seems unlikely that such ample expansion of the record should have been carried out under the aegis of Scaevola as Pontifex Maximus. It is true that the later second century BC was a period of lively antiquarian enquiry. But it is hard to see why in that period the author(s) of such a work should have passed it off as the Pontifex Maximus' record rather than claiming personal credit for its production, as all the known historical and antiquarian writers of the period did for their works.

Frier's theory that the work was carried out under Augustus supplies a more plausible context: Frier supposes that it was produced on Augustus' direction after he became Pontifex Maximus, and compares other collective antiquarian enterprises of the period such as the Fasti Capitolini and the *elogia* describing the careers of great Romans set up below their statues in the Forum Augustum.[56] However, the parallel with other collective antiquarian projects of the Augustan age fails to explain the rationale of the compilation. The products of those other enterprises were put on public display in the monumental centre of Rome. For what purpose should the antiquarians of the day have produced a history of Rome on a more ample scale even than the great work on which their contemporary Livy was engaged, and passed it off as the Pontifex Maximus' record, although much of the material included patently cannot have stood in the genuine record? One may wonder whether Verrius Flaccus, who had access to their sources, would have cited his antiquarian colleagues'

[55] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 108, states that T13 'proves the existence of a section of the chronicle dealing with the regal period ... by Cicero's time' (see also 110, 175). He does not explain how he reconciles this with his Augustan date for the compilation of the eighty-book version.

[56] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 194–200. T. J. Luce in K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire* (Berkeley, 1990), 135–6, suggests that the Augustan version of the *Annales Maximi* postulated by Frier may have been one of the principal sources for the *elogia* in the Forum Augustum.

compilation as an authority. It remains puzzling that so massive a work should have left so little trace in the subsequent tradition.[57]

Thus no solution to the problem of the eighty-book version is free from difficulties. It may have consisted simply of the annual records made by the Pontifices Maximi. Alternatively it may have been a massively expanded compilation produced either by Scaevola's time or during the Augustan age. To each hypothesis there are grave objections.

4. The annalists' use of the Pontifex Maximus' record

If the eighty-book *Annales Maximi* were a greatly amplified version of the Pontifex Maximus' record compiled and published in the later second century BC, their appearance might well have had a significant impact on Roman historical writing. The large scale of Cn. Gellius' history could, in that case, have been in part due to use of the eighty-book *Annales Maximi*. However, such a development is unlikely to have been the crucial turning-point that has sometimes been supposed.[58] The compilers will have drawn on the existing historiographical tradition, and so their additions to the record may not have brought in much new material. In any case, as we have seen, the supposed Scaevolan compilation and publication is just one of the possible hypotheses to explain the character and date of the eighty-book version.

It remains to enquire what use the annalists of the second and first century BC made of the annual notices which the Pontifices Maximi had displayed and which had been preserved in their archive. This question is of fundamental importance for the reliability of the Roman historiographical tradition. As we saw in section 2, the Pontifices Maximi may have begun to keep their record as early as the fifth century and some authentic entries may have been preserved from that time.

Cicero (T2) claims that the Pontifex Maximus' record served as a stylistic model for the first Roman historians. Cicero's concern is solely with style, and he accordingly does not indicate whether these writers also used the record as a source of information, but it is natural to suppose that he took them to have drawn on it for content as well as style. However, Cicero may not have had any good information about the early historians' relation to the Pontifex Maximus' record, and he appears to have been drawing on the theory of a Greek author, perhaps Theophrastus, about the relationship of early historical writers to archives, which later influenced Dionysius.[59]

Another indication of use of the Pontifex Maximus' record by early Roman historians may be afforded by Cato's scornful assertion that he did 'not care to write

[57] Another objection which has been made to Frier's view is that Servius Danielis' statement that the eighty-book version was compiled by *ueteres* should indicate an earlier period than the reign of Augustus (so R. M. Ogilvie, *JRS* 71 (1981), 200; G. V. Sumner, *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 190), but such a reference would in fact be consistent with the usage of late Roman grammarians. D'Anna, *Ciceroniana* 7 (1990), 223–30, defends Frier against this and other objections. In support of Frier's thesis see also Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 26, and (less confidently) 4. 482–3; Wiseman, *Unwritten Rome*, 265; S. J. Northwood, *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdansk, 2007), 108. For criticisms of Frier see esp. Forsythe and Petzold, cited in n. 46.

[58] e.g. Badian, 'Early historians', 15: 'Roman historiography was shattered by the publication.'

[59] See further commentary on F7–9. On Cicero's view of the early historians' debt to the Pontifex Maximus' record see especially Gelzer, *Kl. Schr.* 3. 100–3; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 69–81, 276–8; Oakley, *Comm.* 4. 484.

what is on the tablet at the house of the Pontifex Maximus'. It is likely that Cato is here making an implicit criticism of some of his predecessors who had drawn information from the record which he regarded as too trivial for inclusion in a history.[60]

A considerable volume of material which has the appearance of deriving from archives is present in our sources on the fifth and fourth centuries BC, for example the list of consuls, a range of information on other magistrates, and material on such matters as the foundation of new tribes and colonies, temple-building, pestilence, and food-shortage.[61] The most likely archival source for most of this material is the Pontifex Maximus' record. It is thus likely that, at some stage in the evolution of the annalistic tradition, one or more historical writers consulted the record and that as a result a significant amount of information from it was incorporated into the annalistic account of the early republic. Thus there is probably a 'hard core' of reliable archival information from this and perhaps also from other records in what our sources tell us about the fifth and fourth centuries. However, even among those who accept this conclusion, opinions about the extent of this 'hard core' may legitimately differ, and it is often impossible to determine whether individual items of information are of archival origin. Confusions occurred, and some annalists were adept at recycling material to fill in gaps in the annual record.[62]

It has sometimes been supposed that passages in Livy's narrative where he baldly reports a sequence of discrete events derive indirectly from the Pontifex Maximus' record.[63] This inference is illegitimate. Livy had made a conscious decision to devote less space to the early republic than to later periods, and comparison with Dionysius reveals numerous occasions where he must have shortened what he found in his sources.[64] Very likely, the narratives of some of his predecessors, for example Piso, had alternated between worked-up episodes and bald lists of events, and in the bald lists they may well have been echoing the manner of the Pontifex Maximus' record, as Cicero claims, and perhaps also transcribing directly from it. However, when Livy wrote in this fashion, we can never be sure that he was not simply adopting the style rather than taking over what he found in a source.[65]

On some matters more archival material was available for the early republic than Livy chose to supply. He gives prodigy reports in only twenty of the year-narratives in books 2–10; he could surely have included more if he had chosen. Only at three points in these books does he mention the death of priests, although an inscription from the Forum, probably of Augustan date (*ILS* 9338), shows that a record of fifth-century appointments did exist at least for the augurs.[66]

[60] See further commentary on Cato 5 F80.

[61] Such material in Livy's first decade is tabulated by Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 38–72, 733; 4. 486–90.

[62] For differing views of the extent of the archival 'hard core' see e.g. Drummond, *CAH*^{2} 7.2. 21; Cornell, 'Formation', 67–86; *Beginnings*, 15. Dionysius shows awareness of how literary historians might deploy and sometimes elaborate archival information: see commentary on F7–9, and especially F9.

[63] e.g. Peter 1. xxvi–xxvii.

[64] Note especially Livy's treatment of the years 505–500 (2.16–18) and 456–452 (3.31–2), heavily compressed as a foil to the extended treatment which follows for respectively the battle of Lake Regillus and the Decemvirate. In both cases Dionysius supplies an ampler account (5.37–57; 10.31–56).

[65] Cf. Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 17; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 122–3, 128.

[66] Prodigy reports: B. MacBain, *Prodigy and Expiation* (Brussels, 1982), 82–6. Priests: Livy 3.7.6, 32.3; 10.9.2; Rüpke, *Klio* 75 (1993), 160–5, and *Fasti Sacerdotum* (2008), 27–30; Vaahtera, *Hermes* 130 (2002), 100–8.

As already noticed in section 2, Livy's narrative becomes fuller in book 10, when he reaches the early third century, and the reason may be partly that the entries in the Pontifex Maximus' record now became more detailed. It is, for example, only at this point that Livy begins to include regular notices of the activity of aediles, for which the record is the likely source.[67]

In the other extant portion of Livy's history, books 21–45, covering the years 218–167, material of apparently archival origin is much more plentiful than in the first decade. The year-narratives follow a standard pattern based on the structure of the consular year, and the sections on domestic events include a good detail of routine material which looks as though it derives ultimately from archival sources, for example on the assignment of provinces and armies, the reporting and procuration of prodigies, the games and other activities of the aediles, and the death and replacement of priests. Some writers have taken a highly sceptical position about the reliability of this material.[68] However, although invention and distortion certainly crept in, a substantial proportion of the material must be authentic and go back to archival sources.

It has often been supposed that the principal archival source for this material was the Pontifex Maximus' record, and that the material, and with it the distinctive pattern of the year-narratives, was incorporated into the tradition of annalistic historiography at an early stage. In fact, the distinctive narrative pattern, and the wealth of archival detail that accompanies it, may well be a relatively late feature, perhaps to be credited to Valerius Antias. However that may be, the Pontifex Maximus' record probably played at most only a small part in the process. The pattern of the year-narratives cannot derive from that record since events were presumably listed there simply in the order in which they occurred or were reported, with no distinction between domestic and external activities. In any case, it is unlikely to have been the most important archival source. It will hardly have reported the allocation of provinces and armies in as much detail as Livy supplies. His information on these matters is commonly cast in the form of reports of decisions of the senate, and the record of *senatus consulta* is thus the most likely source. Many of the prodigy notices too may come from the senate's records: the framework of *senatus consulta* may often be detected in the structure of these notices, and Obsequens shows that Livy continued to give regular prodigy notices down to the Social War, a generation after the compilation of the pontifical record had ceased.[69]

Long before it was terminated by Scaevola or his successor, the Pontifex Maximus' annual record had become an anachronism. For historians who were prepared to do archival work, richer material was available elsewhere, and so for the middle republic little use is likely to have been made of this source.

[67] Livy 10.23.11–13 (with Oakley's note ad loc.); 10.31.9; 10.47.3–4. See further at nn. 36–8.

[68] e.g. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 1–15. For criticism of her arguments see E. Ruoff-Väänänen, *Arctos* 7 (1972), 139–62, esp. 145–8; Briscoe, *Comm.* 1, 11–12 n. 4; B. MacBain, *Prodigy and Expiation* (Brussels, 1982); S. Rasmussen, *Public Portents in Republican Rome* (Rome, 2003), 219–39.

[69] See further Rich, 'Structuring Roman history', and *BICS* 48 (2005), 137–61; introduction to 25 Antias.

5. *Testimonia and fragments*

The three most important testimonia have been grouped together (T1–3). These are followed by the other testimonia which certainly refer to the Pontifex Maximus' record (T4–12). Doubtful testimonia are reserved to a separate group (T13–15). Within each group the testimonia are arranged by date of composition.

The fragments are presented in two groups, and within each group in chronological order of the events to which they refer. The first group (F1–6) comprises fragments which are certainly ascribed (under various designations) to the Pontifex Maximus' record: in each case issues arise as to which version of the record is meant and/or whether the citation is authentic. The second group (F7–12) comprises passages where the source may have intended to cite the Pontifex Maximus' record, but this ascription is not certain. The problems posed by the fragments in both groups are discussed in this introduction and in the commentary.

At T14 and F7–10 the reference is to archival records, but it is uncertain whether it relates to the Pontifex Maximus' record.[70]

At T13 the reference to *annales publici* probably relates to the Pontifex Maximus' record. The references to *annales* at T15 and F11–12 may relate to the record, but more probably literary histories are meant.[71]

We have omitted numerous passages referring to unidentified *annales* which must in our view relate to literary histories. Le Clerc, who made the first attempt to collect passages referring to or citing the Pontifex Maximus' record, included a large number of such texts as relating to the record, for which he was rightly criticized by Hulleman.[72] Chassignet includes such passages under the rubric of 'anonymous *annales*'.[73]

(JWR)

[70] See at nn. 4, 17–19, 34 and commentary on F7–10.
[71] See at nn. 27, 50 and commentary on F11–12.
[72] Le Clerc, *Des journaux chez les Romains* (1838), 344–73; Hulleman, *Disputatio* (1855), 20–32.
[73] Chassignet 1. 4–16 (F9–40).

1

Q. Fabius Pictor

Editions: Peter 1^2. lxix–c, 5–39; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 809; Chassignet 1. l–lxxiii, 16–54; Beck–Walter 1. 55–136.

Principal discussions: H. K. Whitte, *de Q. Fabio Pictore ceterisque Fabiis historicis disputatio* (Diss. Copenhagen, 1832); E. Baumgart, *de Q. Fabio Pictore antiquissimo Romanorum historico* 1 (Bratislava, 1842); W. Harless, *De Fabiis et Aufidiis rerum Romanorum scriptoribus* (Diss. Bonn, 1853); Mommsen, 'Fabius und Diodor', *RF* 2 (1879), 221–96; W. Soltau, 'Die lateinischen Annalen des Fabius Pictor', *NJPhP* 132 (1886), 479–80; G. Pasciucco, *Quinto Fabio Pittore, il più antico fra gli scrittori romani di 'annali'* (Naples, 1901) (*non uidimus*); F. Münzer, 'Q. Fabius (126) Pictor', *RE* 6 (1909), 1836–41; G. Costa, 'Fabio Pittore e Sallustio', *RSA* 13 (1909), 30–41; Leo, *GRL* 1 (1913), 85–8; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 123–5; Beloch, *RG* (1926), 95–101; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 168–74; R. C. W. Zimmermann, 'Zu Fabius Pictor', *Klio* 26 (1933), 248–66; M. Gelzer, 'Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor', *Hermes* 68 (1933), 129–66 (=*Kl. Schr.* 3. 51–92= Pöschl, *RGS* 77–129); M. Gelzer, 'Der Anfang römischer Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes* 69 (1934), 46- 55 (=*Kl. Schr.* 3, 93–103=Pöschl, *RGS* 130–43); F. Altheim, *Epochen der römischen Geschichte* 2 (Frankfurt a.M., 1935), 305–13; A. Klotz, 'Zu den Quellen der Archaiologia des Dionysios von Halikarnassos', *RhM* 87 (1938), 32–50; U. Knoche, 'Roms älteste Geschichtsschreibung', *NJAB* 2 (1939), 193–207 (=Pöschl, *RGS*, 222–40); F. Altheim, 'Diodors römische Annalen', *RhM* 93 (1950), 267–86; P. Bung, *Q. Fabius Pictor, der erste römische Annalist* (Diss. Cologne, 1950); F. Bömer, 'Naevius und Fabius Pictor', *SO* 29 (1952), 43–53; F. Bömer, 'Thematik und Krise der römischen Geschichtsschreibung im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *Historia* 2 (1953–4), 189–209, esp. 198–204; M. Gelzer, 'Nochmals über den Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes* 82 (1954), 342–8 (=*Kl. Schr.* 3, 104–10=Pöschl, *RGS* 144–53); K. Hanell, 'Zur Problematik der älteren römischen Geschichtsschreibung', in *Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité*, *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 4 (Geneva, 1956), 149–70 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 292–311); A. Momigliano, 'Linee per una valutazione di Fabio Pittore', *RAL* ser. 8, 15 (1960), 310–20 (=*Terzo contributo*, 55–68); F. Branchini, 'Note su Fabio Pittore', *Athenaeum* 39 (1961), 358–61; G. Perl, 'Der Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *F&F* 38 (1964), 185–9, 213–18; Alföldi, *Early Rome* (1965), 101–75 and *passim*; G. Vitucci, 'Ancora su Fabio Pittore', *Helikon* 6 (1966), 401–10; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 2–6; A. Momigliano, Review of Alföldi, *Early Rome*, in *JRS* 57 (1967), 211–16 (=*Quarto contributo*, 487–99); Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria' (1967), 133–69; D. Timpe, 'Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge der römischen Historiographie', *ANRW* 1, 2 (1972), 928–69; G. Manganaro, 'Una biblioteca storica nel ginnasio di Tauromenion e il P.Oxy. 1241', *PdP* 29 (1974), 389–409; B. Gentili, 'Storiografia greca e storiografia romana arcaica', *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 13–38; I. E. M. Edlund, 'Fabius Pictor: a negligent historian', *RSC* 24 (1976), 329–35; G. Manganaro, 'Una biblioteca storica nel ginnasio a Tauromenion nel II sec. a.C.', in A. Alföldi, *Römische Frühgeschichte* (Heidelberg, 1976), 83–96; J. Poucet, 'Fabius Pictor et Denys d'Halicarnasse: "les enfances de Romulus et de Rémus"', *Historia* 25 (1976), 201–16; Frier, *Libri Annales* (1979), 227–84; G. P. Verbrugghe, 'Three notes on Fabius Pictor and his History', in *Φιλίας χάριν: studi . . . E. Manni* 6 (Rome, 1980), 2159–73; D. Timpe, 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit als Basis der frührömischen Überlieferung', in J. von Ungern-Sternberg, H. Reinau, *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Stuttgart, 1988), 266–86; A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990), 80–108; K. Meister, *Die*

griechische Geschichtsschreibung (Stuttgart, 1990), 145–8; K.-E. Petzold, 'Die Geschichte der römischen Annalistik', in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius* (Konstanz, 1993), 151–88; M. Carulli, 'Fabio Pittore: eredità dell'annalistica religiosa ed influsso della storiografia ellenistica', in *De tuo tibi: studi . . . I. Lana* (Bologna, 1996), 87–114; E. Gabba, 'Origine e carattere della più antica storiografia romana', *Eutopia* 5 (1996), 3–11; Flach, *RGS* (1998), 61–7; F. M. D'Ippolito, 'Fabio Pittore revisitato', *A&R* 43 (1998), 142–55; F.-H. Mutschler, 'Norm und Erinnerung: Anmerkungen zur sozialen Funktion von historischen Epos und Geschichtsschreibung', in M. Braun, A. Haltenhof, F.-H. Mutschler (eds.), *Moribus antiquis res stat Romana* (Munich, 2000), 87–124; U. W. Scholz, 'Q. Fabius Pictor', *WJA* 24 (2000), 139–49; J. Dillery, 'Quintus Fabius Pictor and Greco-Roman historiography at Rome', in J. F. Miller, C. Damon, K. S. Myers (eds.), *Vertis in usum. Studies . . . E. Courtney* (Munich, 2002), 1–23; W. Kierdorf, 'Anfänge und Grundlagen der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Klio* 84 (2002), 400–13; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 359–70; H. Beck, '"Den Ruhm nicht teilen wollen". Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge des römischen Nobilitätsdiskurses', in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG* (2003), 73–92; S. J. Northwood, 'Was Fabius Pictor an annalist?', in N. V. Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdansk, 2007), 97–114.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The life of Quintus Fabius Pictor, the first Roman historian, was roughly contemporary with that of his kinsman, Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, the famous *Cunctator*.[1] We know that Fabius Pictor fought in the Gallic War of 225 BC (T1), and that he was sent by the senate to Delphi in 216 BC to consult the oracle after the disaster at Cannae (T3–4). We are not told of any magistracy, but he was a member of the senate (Pol. 3.9.4=T6, and, implicitly, T4), and he must have been a relatively senior figure when chosen to head the embassy to Delphi. Other qualifications will have included his knowledge of Greek language and culture, and perhaps a family tradition of diplomacy in the Greek East.[2] Piety may also be assumed, but there is no evidence that he had any special religious expertise or priestly authority, and it can be demonstrated that he was not an *augur* or a *pontifex*; if he held one of the major priesthoods, it would have been as a *decemuir sacris faciundis*, but this remains a matter of conjecture.[3] Even so, an interest in ritual is suggested by the fragments, and the episode of the Delphic embassy speaks for itself.

[1] That the two men were related is confirmed by Plutarch (T3). Fabius Maximus was born probably before 280, since he must have been at least an adolescent when appointed an augur in 265 BC (Liv. 30.26.7; Val. Max. 8.13.3; Plin. *nat.* 7.156): see D. E. Hahm, *TAPhA* 94 (1963), 77 n. 4. Valerius Maximus (l.c.) cannot be right in saying that Fabius Maximus obtained the augurate at a 'robust' age, and therefore lived for 'easily a century'.

[2] Thus, Beck–Walter 1. 57. The evidence is a famous embassy to the court of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in 275 (DH 20.14; Val. Max. 4.3.9), which included N. Fabius Pictor, probably the historian's uncle, and Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges, probably his father's cousin (see Frier, *Libri Annales*, 229–30).

[3] All the patrician members of the pontifical college, and most of the patrician augurs, are known for this period, and they do not include Fabius Pictor (*MRR* 1. 281–4). Moreover Fabius Cunctator was (most unusually) a member of both colleges, and it may have been illegal for two members of the same *gens* to belong to the same priestly college (Dio 39.17.1, with the comments of Mommsen, *RF* 1. 80–90; Badian, *Arethusa* 1 (1968), 31–6; C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan* (Cambridge, 2006), 309–10; on the other hand it has

Also conjectural, but likely enough in the circumstances, is the possibility that he was an ex-praetor at the time of the embassy to Delphi; if so, he would have held the office before 218 BC.[4] The only other item of evidence bearing on his career is F20, which tells us that he held a position of command in a war against the Ligurians. Roman military activity in Liguria is attested throughout the 230s and 220s, the earliest campaign dating from 238, the latest from 223;[5] Pictor's involvement (when he commanded a garrison under siege) could be placed at any time during that period. Frier has made a good case for 233, when Fabius Maximus Verrucosus triumphed over the Ligurians as consul, and may have employed his cousin as a senior field officer;[6] this is attractive, but obviously not certain.

The evidence combines to suggest that Fabius Pictor was born around 270 BC;[7] certainly there are difficulties in a date earlier than around 280 or much later than 260 (if his command in Liguria is dated in the 230s). This dating strongly supports the further possibility that he was the son of the consul of 269, C. Fabius C.f. M.n. Pictor; the historian's filiation, as 'son of Gaius', is confirmed by the Tauromenium inscription (T7).[8] If so, we can place Fabius Pictor securely in the family tree of the patrician Fabii, one of the most distinguished houses of the Roman nobility. According to Frier's convincing reconstruction (*Libri Annales*, 225, 227–31), the historian was a second cousin of Fabius Cunctator, a great-nephew of Fabius Maximus Rullianus, the hero of the Samnite Wars, and a great-grandson of M. Fabius Ambustus, the dominant political figure of the mid-fourth century (see comm. on F17).[9]

His distinctive surname Pictor (='Painter') was first carried by the C. Fabius who painted the walls of the temple of Salus in 304 BC, during the Second Samnite War

been argued that the law was introduced only in the late republic: J. A. North in *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l'antiquité romaine* (Rome, 1990), 527–31; A. Drummond, *Historia* 57 (2008), 367–407). That Fabius was a *decemvir s.f.* was suggested by H. Diels, *Die Sibyllinische Blätter* (Berlin, 1890), 10–13, 106 (with a far-fetched theory that he composed some of the Sibylline oracles); Münzer, *RE* 9. 1837; cf. Verbrugghe, *Studi . . . Manni* 6 (1980), 2163–4.

[4] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 235.

[5] Details in *MRR*, *sub annis*. Note that the record for this period is pitifully inadequate, and there may have been more campaigns in Liguria than are reported in our meagre sources.

[6] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 234.

[7] Thus, Frier, ibid. 231, now widely followed: Chassignet 1. lv; Beck–Walter 1. 56; Flach, *RGS*[3] 61–7; Kierdorf, *RGS* 9; *Klio* 84 (2002), 401; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 361. This reconstruction cannot be absolutely certain. A later date remains possible: thus e.g. Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 22, preferring a date between 255 and 250.

[8] The Tauromenium inscription (T7) is one of a series of texts painted on the wall of the gymnasium at Tauromenium in Sicily, each dealing with an ancient writer and giving information about his life and works. Apart from Fabius, the writers who have been identified so far include two other historians, Callisthenes and Philistus, and one philosopher (Anaximander of Miletus). The standard interpretation is that the building was actually the library of the gymnasium, and that the texts painted on the wall, which resemble catalogue entries, were designed to advertise some of the library's holdings and to provide information about their authors (see Manganaro, *PdP* 52 (1974), 389–409; H. Blanck, *PdP* 52 (1997), 241–55; F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 169–80).

[9] Frier's reconstruction of the family tree is extremely probable, but in the nature of these things cannot be conclusive. It remains theoretically possible that the Fabii Pictores were descended from M. Fabius Dorsuo (cos. 345), rather than from M. Fabius Ambustus (cos. 360 etc.): thus e.g. Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 393. But Plutarch (*Fab.* 18.3 (T3b)) describes Pictor as a kinsman (*συγγενής*) of Fabius Cunctator, which would not easily apply to a great-grandson of Dorsuo, who was from a separate branch from Ambustus.

(Cic. *Tusc.* 1.4; Val. Max. 8.14.6); according to Pliny (*nat.* 35.19) the frescos survived until the temple burned down in the reign of Claudius. Both Cicero and Valerius Maximus describe him as *nobilissimus*, in contrast to his lowly artistic interests: he was presumably the grandfather of the historian.[10] The Tauromenium inscription calls the historian 'Pictorinus', which is unparalleled and at first sight surprising, but is actually a relatively common variation for a Roman *cognomen* (cf. Rufus–Rufinus, Corvus–Corvinus, Augur–Augurinus, etc.).[11]

The historian's descendants include a praetor of 189, probably his eldest son, who was also *flamen Quirinalis*.[12] More speculatively the Fabius Pictor (probably N. Fabius Pictor) mentioned in Cic. *Brut.* 81 has been identified as the son of the foregoing, and therefore the historian's grandson, and as the father of N. Fabius Pictor, a moneyer in 126 BC.[13] The political dominance of the family in Fabius Pictor's time, and the immense weight of their legendary tradition and historical distinction, cannot have failed to leave a mark on his history (see further below).

Nothing more is heard of Fabius after his return from Delphi in 216. We do not know when he died, or when he composed his history. The latest event referred to in the fragments is the battle of Trasimene (F23). Whether he survived the war, and lived to see the subsequent Roman intervention in the eastern Mediterranean, and if so whether these experiences influenced his writing, are questions to which no firm answers can be given, but which profoundly affect our assessment of his work; and to this we now turn.

Work

Fabius Pictor was the first Roman to write the history of his city (T11–12), and he did so in Greek. This is unequivocally stated by Cicero (T10) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (T12), and must be taken as a fact, but it is sobering to reflect that without these two references it would never have been suspected.[14] On the contrary: all the other evidence seems to point in a quite different direction. It has long been accepted that several of the preserved fragments can only have come from a Latin text (F4d–e, F29, F31), and that both Cicero (T8–9) and Fronto (T18) list Fabius as a

[10] Frier (*Libri Annales*, 229) plausibly identifies him with the C. Fabius M.f. N.n. Ambustus who was *magister equitum* in 315 BC (*Fast. Cap.*; Liv. 9.23.6), although Oakley disagrees (*Comm.* 3. 293, ad loc.). Cicero's *nobilissimus* (*Tusc.* 1.4) refers to the painter, not to his grandson, the historian, as Peter (1². lxix) thought; it therefore rules out Zimmerman's eccentric notion (*Klio* 26 (1933), 261–6) that the first Pictor was a freed slave. A similar notion can also be found in E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* (Munich, 1923), 751. On the significance of Fabius' artistic endeavours cf. F. Coarelli, *Revixit ars* (Rome, 1996), 21–31.

[11] See the important discussion of Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 30–2, noting that the inscription provides the earliest evidence we have for variation between the simple form and the form in *-inus* of a person's name (which had become common by the early empire). Suerbaum (in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 360) regards *Pictorinus* as 'die in Sizilien gebräuchliche Form des Ethnikons', but the text specifies *Ῥωμαῖος*, so the author of the inscription could hardly have taken 'Pictorinus' to be an ethnic (cf. F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 178).

[12] He died in 167: Liv. 45.44.3; Münzer, *RE* 6. 1841–2.

[13] Crawford, *RRC* 291–2 (no. 268). For the *praenomen* of the Fabius Pictor mentioned by Cicero, *Brut.* 81, see n. 19.

[14] Though it is now supported by the Tauromenium inscription, which refers to a copy of Fabius' history in the local library; on any reasonable view this work must have been in Greek.

Latin writer in discussions of historical style.[15] The conclusion seems inescapable: historical works in both Greek and Latin circulated under the name of Fabius Pictor.

There is a further complication. Surprisingly few of the fragments are ascribed specifically to Fabius Pictor. Most of them, and around half the testimonia, refer simply to 'Fabius', or sometimes to 'Q. Fabius'. While we can be confident that most of these should be assigned to Fabius Pictor,[16] in a few cases the matter is less clear. There were other writers named Fabius, some of them historians or antiquarians.[17] They include Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8), listed by DH as one of the historians approved by the Romans themselves (8 T1), Fabius Rusticus (87), a contemporary of Pliny and Tacitus, and three writers who have sometimes been taken for historians but whom we have relegated to the appendix: M. Fabius (A20), Fabius Gallus (A21), and Fabius Vestalis (A22). At least some of the fragments traditionally ascribed to Pictor could instead be given to one or more of these (e.g. F27, F28, F29, F32), and even some of the fragments where 'Fabius' is described as a historian or a writer of annals could theoretically belong to Fabius Maximus Servilianus (e.g. F3, F14, F31, F24).

Unfortunately these two problems do not cancel each other out. While some of the Latin fragments could be assigned to a different Fabius (most obviously F29 and F31), others are categorically attributed to Fabius Pictor (F4d, F4e). The existence of a Latin Fabius Pictor cannot therefore be so easily evaded. The simplest explanation of the evidence we have is that Fabius Pictor wrote his history in Greek, but that a later stage it was made available in a Latin version, produced either by the author himself or by someone else.[18] We might then assume that Greek writers generally used the Greek version, and that at least some Latin authors used the Latin version. In many cases, e.g. those of Livy or Pliny the Elder, we would have no way of knowing which version they used. There is also the possibility that some of our citing authorities knew of Pictor only at second hand—in which case the question becomes meaningless.

[15] These passages are best read in full under General Testimonia: GT1, 2, 6. It is just conceivable that in the *De oratore* passage (GT1) Cicero is concerned only with the form and content of the works in question (as Woodman contends: *Rhetoric*, 76–95), and not with their language and style, but this goes against most scholarly opinion and seems to most of us to amount to special pleading (cf. General Introduction, I. 20). As for the *De legibus* and Fronto passages (GT2, 6), they make no sense if the works discussed were not written in Latin.

[16] This must be true of all citations of 'Fabius' or 'Quintus Fabius' by Polybius (for chronological reasons), and most of those by DH, Livy, and Plutarch. Sometimes these authors make the matter clear by association (F5, F7 (DH: Fabius bracketed with Cincius)), or by some other means (e.g. F16 (where Livy calls Fabius *longe antiquissimus auctor*); cf. F10, F12, F23). In F21a–h Eutropius and Orosius also clearly identify Pictor: *Fabius historicus, qui ei(dem) bello interfuit* (225 BC).

[17] But Cicero's reference to Fabii in the plural in F14 should not be taken as a reference to more than one historian named Fabius. It is an example of a common Latin idiom meaning 'people like . . .' Cicero means Fabius Pictor, and by '*Gellii*' he means Cn. Gellius. Cf. Kühner–Gerth 15, Kühner–Stegmann 72, Hofmann–Szantyr 19; cf. I. 228 n. 5, 253, 363.

[18] A Latin translation of Pictor's original text: Beloch, *RG* 98; Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 16 n. 2; Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 57; Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 170 n. 1. For the view that Fabius himself translated his own text, Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933), 253; Bung, *Q. Fabius Pictor* (1950), 204; Boldrini, *Athenaeum* 39 (1961), 358; E. Ruschenbusch, *Die frühen römischen Annalisten* (Wiesbaden, 2004), 9: 'gleichzeitiger lateinische Übersetzung'. A later translation: Schanz–Hosius 1⁴. 172, 173 4; Badian, 'Early historians', 30 n. 27; Schulz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 139. Further bibliography and discussion in Chassignet 1. lviii–lxii.

At the opposite pole is the idea that the Latin history was a totally different work either by Fabius Pictor himself or by someone else with the same name. While the first of these alternatives, though theoretically possible, can be dismissed as far-fetched, the second must be taken seriously, because we happen to know of another Fabius Pictor who was a literary figure in his own right: this was the orator mentioned by Cicero in *Brut.* 81. This man, Numerius Fabius Pictor,[19] was probably the grandson of our historian, and is described by Cicero as an expert in law, literature, and the study of the past (*et iuris et litterarum et antiquitatis bene peritus*). It may have been he who wrote the work on pontifical law (*commentarii iuris pontificii*) that is cited in antiquarian sources under the name Fabius Pictor.[20] Such a work would fit Cicero's description of N. Pictor's interests, and it is reasonable to identify him as its author. But Cicero's words would not in themselves exclude a historical work, and this has led some to suspect that N. Pictor was also the author of the Latin annals.[21]

On the other hand it would be very surprising to find Cicero using such a vague phrase if he had known that N. Fabius Pictor had written an independent history;[22] and in general the strongest single argument against the theory of two different histories by two different Fabii Pictores is precisely the fact that none of our sources seems to have been aware of any such thing.[23] On the contrary, the evidence we have is most easily explained on the assumption that the Greek history and the Latin history were essentially the same work—that is, that the latter was a version of the former[24]—and that Q. Fabius Pictor was its author. That said, it may be acknowledged that all kinds of intermediate positions are possible. The Latin work may not have been an exact translation of the Greek original; it may have been abridged, expanded, or otherwise modified. Peter, for example, thought that the translator/editor continued Pictor's history and brought it up to date.[25] But it is clear that, once the basic point is conceded, the identity of the translator/editor, and the nature of his revisions, if any, are questions entirely beyond our control, the pursuit of which would be both unprofitable and impracticable.

The conclusion that only one Fabius Pictor wrote history, and that it circulated in two versions, is provisionally accepted here as a working hypothesis. While we

[19] The *praenomen* is a problem. Once read as Ser(vius), based on the reading of B, it is now agreed to have been Numerius, after Martha's emendation was upheld by Badian: *JRS* 57 (1967), 228; accepted by Sumner, *Orators*, 43; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 232.

[20] Nine fragments are assembled by Peter 1. 114–16. In F9 Nonius (223M = 330L) quotes Varro: *<in> commentario ueteris Fabi Pictoris legi* . . . Varro's description of Fabius Pictor as *uetus* confirms the early date for this author.

[21] Thus Peter 1. lxxvii–lxxxi; clxxiv; Soltau, *NJPhP* 132 (1886), 479–80; Münzer, *RE* 6, 1843; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 133; Gelzer, *Hermes* 69 (1934), 48; 82 (1954), 344 (= Pöschl, *RGS* 133, 147); Frier, *Libri Annales*, 250–1 ('without much conviction').

[22] Especially as he explicitly mentions A. Postumius Albinus' history in the preceding sentence (4 T4).

[23] Thus, rightly, Hanell in *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 171–2 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 303–4).

[24] But note that Leo (*GRL* 1. 86 n. 1) inverted this relationship, and supposed that the Latin version was Fabius Pictor's original draft, from which he composed his Greek version—and that it was preserved by the Fabii and subsequently put into circulation. This perverse idea was revived by F. D'Ippolito, *A&R* 43 (1998), 142–55. An even more extreme theory was proposed by H. B. Mattingly, *LCM* 1 (1976), 3–7, who attributed the Latin annals to Q. Fabius Pictor, the praetor of 189 BC (*RE* 127), and the Greek version to the later Fabius Pictor (*RE* 128) mentioned by Cic. *Brut.* 81. This is refuted by T1, 2, and 3c, and by the filiation in T7; cf. N. Horsfall, *LCM* 1 (1976), 18.

[25] Peter 1. lxxx–lxxxi.

acknowledge that other interpretations are possible, and have been careful to point these out in the commentary on individual fragments, we have taken all the fragments to belong to the same work—a procedure that affords us the great practical advantage of being able to order them in a single sequence.[26]

We have ordered the fragments in chronological order of events referred to, where these can be identified,[27] since all the indications are that Fabius' history was a chronological narrative of events from the beginning to his own time. The overall shape of the work, and the way in which the material was arranged, are difficult questions that will be tackled presently; for now it may be observed that it began with the legendary prehistory of the city, dealing with the adventures of Aeneas (F1–3), Heracles (T7),[28] and possibly Evander (F27). It went on to cover the foundation of the city, the kings, and the republic down to the Second Punic War. The latest event recorded in the fragments is the battle of Trasimene (217), but it is a reasonable supposition that Livy's detailed account (T4) of Fabius' visit to Delphi, and his report to the senate on his return, goes back to Fabius' own account.[29]

We do not know when Fabius made the pioneering decision to write the history of Rome. It is theoretically possible that he did so as a relatively young man, inspired by Rome's victory over Carthage in the First Punic War and his own experiences in the Ligurian and Gallic Wars, particularly in the great emergency of 225 BC. On this view Hannibal's invasion would have occurred after he had started and perhaps when a considerable portion of the work was already written. But he would in that case have gone on to include at least some if not all of the Second Punic War. This hypothetical speculation is offered merely as an illustration of what is possible.[30] The fact that it is perfectly compatible with all the evidence serves to show that the standard views on this matter, which maintain that Fabius was inspired by the events of the Hannibalic War itself, and began writing when Rome's victory was assured, or after it had been

[26] Chassignet has done the same, and for the same reason. Peter separated them and printed them under different authors, in line with his view that they were independent works. For his part, Jacoby printed the Greek fragments and the Latin fragments separately (respectively F1–27, F28–33), but within the same entry and in the same sequence, thereby signifying that he regarded them as different versions of a work by a single author, Fabius Pictor. The resulting arrangements (in both Peter and Jacoby) are misleading, however, because they conceal the fact that most of the fragments assigned to the 'Greek' history cannot actually be ascribed with certainty to either version.

[27] The fragments that cannot certainly be placed in context (F24–6) are printed in chronological order of citing authorities.

[28] The Tauromenium inscription (T7: see , n. 8), which purports to summarize the contents of Fabius' work, deals only with the origins of the city. The standard explanation is that the summary covered only the first book (Frier, *Libri Annales*, 230; Chassignet 1. 16 n. 1; Beck–Walter 1. 61; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 404), but this is a rash assumption, since the text breaks off after fifteen lines and we have no idea how much is missing. It could have gone on to summarize the rest of the work (cf. F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 178).

[29] That Livy depends, directly or indirectly, on Fabius' own narrative is likely enough on general grounds (Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 177 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 304–5); Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 56; Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 2–5), and appears to be confirmed by Appian (*Hann.* 27.116=T3c) who, when reporting the senate's appointment of Fabius Pictor, describes him as 'the historian of these events' (*τὸν συγγραφέα τῶνδε τῶν ἔργων*). Cf. Peter 1. lxxii; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 235–6.

[30] The heterodox view that Fabius began writing before the Hannibalic War (already suggested by Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933), 261), has now been advanced as a tenable hypothesis (and quite rightly so) by Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 401–2.

achieved, have no basis in the evidence, and that arguments about his aims and intentions based on the alleged time of writing are circular.[31]

The question of when the narrative ended, however, is a different matter, and some further argument is possible. It is rather surprising that Livy, who recognized his authority as a contemporary witness for the Second Punic War (T2=F23), does not cite him for any event later than 217 BC, even on occasions where a reference to Fabius might have been expected. Thus, on two occasions Livy speaks of writers who were nearer to the living memory of events, but without mentioning Fabius, perhaps implying that he was no longer available.[32] This argument, while not absolutely conclusive, suggests that Fabius' history ended between 216 and 213 BC, probably because death or infirmity prevented him from continuing.[33] This does not necessarily mean, however, that he died soon after 212 BC, as Frier maintains; it is perfectly possible that he was writing years afterwards, in the 190s or even later, but that death overtook him when he had brought the narrative down to some time after 216. Frier argues that he would have been too old to have started after the defeat of Carthage;[34] but old age is not an impediment to historical composition, and it is perfectly conceivable that Fabius was over 70 when he began. His most important successor, Cato, was in his eighties when he wrote the *Origines* (see introduction to no. 5).

In short, apart from the fact that he was able to record events of 217 BC, and probably of 216, we have no idea when Fabius was writing. We do not know how long he worked on the history, or when he stopped; equally we do not know when he started, or what inspired him to write. This applies to literary inspiration as well as the effect of historical events. Whether Fabius wrote before or after the appearance of Cn. Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, an epic poem in Latin on the First Punic War, or of the pro-Carthaginian history of the war by Philinus of Acragas (T6), are questions that cannot be answered on the evidence currently available; the same can be said of the Greek historians who accompanied Hannibal, and wrote about the Second Punic War from a Carthaginian point of view.[35] If we knew for certain that Fabius was writing in the 190s, we could reasonably conjecture that he was reacting to some or all of these; but as we do not, we cannot.

[31] Cf. previous note. For the theory that Fabius was writing during the war: Leo, *GRL* 1, 87; Knoche, *NJAB* 2 (1939), 199 (=Pöschl, *RGS*, 230); Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 177–8 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 304–5); Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 169–70; Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 956; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 236–46; Chassignet 1. lvi–lviii; Beck–Walter 1. 60. That he wrote after the war: Münzer, *RE* 6. 1837; Schanz–Hosius 1[4]. 171–2; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 125; Gelzer, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 132 n. 2 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 82 n. 22) and *passim*; Bömer, *SO* 29 (1952), 37; Badian, 'Early historians', 4. Non-committal (but either during or after the war): Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 56–8, 65; *Classical Foundations* (1990), 89. In our view, the only proper approach is to leave the question completely open; thus, Scholz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 142–4.

[32] Livy 25.11.20 (212 BC): *plures propioresque aetate memoriae tradunt* ('as recorded by the majority, and by those who were closer in time to the memory of the events'); 29.14.9 (204 BC): *traditum a proximis memoriae temporum illorum scriptoribus* ('reported by writers closest to the memory of those times').

[33] Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933) 262–3; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 236–7; Chassignet 1. lvii. The argument is not conclusive, however, as D. Hoyos points out (*ZPE* 134 (2001), 78): Hoyos argues that Pictor was the author of PRyl. 491, a historical fragment dealing with the events of 203 BC normally attributed (we think rightly) to one of the pro-Carthaginian Greek historians of the war (see n. 35).

[34] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 237; also Chassignet 1. lvii and n. 217; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 401.

[35] Sosylus of Sparta, *FGrHist* 176; Silenus of Caleacte, *FGrHist* 175; others include Chaereas, *FGrHist* 177, Eumachus of Naples, *FGrHist* 178, Xenophon, *FGrHist* 179, and unspecified others, *FGrHist* 180.

The idea that Fabius was reacting to hostile Greek accounts of Roman actions, and aimed to set the record straight, is one of the explanations that have been offered for Fabius' decision to write in Greek. That he was at least partly targeting a Greek audience is a reasonable assumption, but it seems unlikely that his sole, or even his main, purpose was to justify Rome's policy and to respond to hostile criticism of her actions, as the more extreme versions of this theory maintain.[36] There is little or no evidence in the fragments that Fabius was engaged in crude propaganda.[37] Naturally his account of the Punic Wars presented Roman actions in a good light (T5), but that is not the same thing. It is likely enough that Fabius was able to take advantage of the Greek language to explain Roman traditions and institutions to a wider world that was unfamiliar with them, especially if he felt that existing Greek accounts were inadequate or poorly informed (in particular, F15, F25, and F26 look as if they were aimed at a non-Roman readership). He also took care to write in terms that would be comprehensible to non-Roman readers; he used Olympic dating (F5), expressed sums of money in talents (F12), perhaps gave a Greek translation of Pometia (F30), and possibly measured distances in stades (F4a, section 79.4).[38]

But Fabius was also, beyond doubt, writing for his fellow Romans—at least for that section of the elite that could read Greek; according to E. S. Gruen, his history 'must have been intended primarily for Romans'.[39] More probably he was writing for both home and overseas readers, and aimed at a worldwide audience. Recent studies have highlighted the interesting possibility that he was mindful of Greek-speaking readers in Italy and Sicily.[40] The fact that a library in Tauromenium possessed a copy suggests that it caught the attention of Sicilians, and the catalogue entry (T7) shows that Fabius stressed the mythical connections between Rome and Sicily.[41] Further Sicilian references and connections occur in F28 and F32, but in both cases the context is uncertain, as is the attribution to Fabius Pictor (see comm. ad locc.).

However that may be, Fabius' use of Greek may not have been the result of a conscious choice. It may indeed have been quite natural, since history was a Greek literary genre, and the possibility of writing in Latin may not have occurred to him.

[36] Gelzer, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 129–66; 69 (1934), 46–55; 82 (1954), 342–8 (= Pöschl, *RGS* 77–129; 130–43; 144–53); Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 163–5 (= Pöschl, *RGS* 305–6); C. P. T. Naudé, *AClass* 4 (1961), 53–5; Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 169–70; Badian, 'Early historians', 4–6; W. V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1979), 109–10.

[37] Thus, Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 64: 'se Fabio era un propagandista, non lo era in maniera volgare.' Cf. C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, 1983), 40–1.

[38] There is obviously no guarantee that the wording of F4a reflects Fabius, rather than DH: see the remarks of Poucet, *Historia* 26 (1976), 201–16. It is sometimes suggested that the mention of talents in F12 shows that Livy must have used the Greek version of Fabius. Since Livy was writing in Latin, this argument refutes itself.

[39] Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 231; in general on this issue see Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 104–6.

[40] Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 411; Manganaro, *PdP* 29 (1974), 395–6 and in Alföldi, *Römische Frühgeschichte* (1976), 87–8; C. P. Jones, *HSCPh* 97 (1995), 235–6; E.-H. Mutschler in *Moribus antiquis* (2000), 100; A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2001), 40–1.

[41] The inscription mentions Lanoios, the eponymous founder of Lanuvium, who hailed from Centuripae according to an inscription published by Manganaro, *RAAN* 38 (1963), 23–44; cf. J. and L. Robert, *REG* 78 (1965), 197–9 (no. 499); R. K. Sherk, *Municipal Decrees of the Roman West* (Buffalo, NY, 1970), no. 59 (with English translation). The original edition of the Tauromenium inscription (reproduced in Chassignet, F1) spoke of the 'return' (*νόστον*) of Lanoios, but this reading is no longer accepted: F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 176–7.

At the time Fabius was writing, Greek was the language of history, and not only for Greeks: Egyptians, Babylonians, Jews, and possibly Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Etruscans, and others had taken the opportunity to write their national histories in Greek.[42] Fabius was not alone. The question, indeed, is not why Fabius wrote history in Greek, but why he wrote history at all.

What passed for a historical tradition in Rome before Fabius was a body of received legends and memories, transmitted by oral reports, stories attached to public and private monuments, priestly records (in particular the *Annales Maximi*—see I. 141–59), and the traditions of the great aristocratic families.[43] Fabius Pictor evidently believed that he could improve on this by applying to it the principles and methods of Greek historiography, thereby ordering the disparate material into a coherent narrative, and using his independent judgement in assessing and interpreting it. This was a truly revolutionary step, as Momigliano recognized.[44]

It has been argued that Latin prose was insufficiently developed at this time to carry a work of such scope as Pictor's,[45] but to argue the weakness of Latin in the age of Plautus seems hazardous, especially as Plautus himself reveals the existence of established prose styles and at least the possibility of developed prose literature.[46] We do not know when the Latin version of Fabius appeared, but it could have been within a few years of the original; there is no reason to rule out a date before the appearance of Cato's *Origines*. Indeed, if anything, the fact that Cato's *Origines* is nowhere hailed as the first history in Latin prose could be a sign that Fabius' Latin history was regarded as a precursor (see introduction to Cato, I. 196).

The existence of a Latin version, which may have differed somewhat from the Greek original, raises difficulties when we come to consider the structure and economy of the work. Only three fragments are preserved with book numbers. Two of these (F4e, F31) are from the Latin version, while the third (F4c), from the *OGR*, could be from either. Although these fragments suggest that, at least in the Latin version, the birth and upbringing of Romulus and Remus occurred in book 1 (F4), and the first plebeian consul (366 BC) in book 4 (F31), we cannot be sure that the same book structure was reproduced in the Greek version. Any attempt to reconstruct the economy of the work from this evidence is hazardous at best and in any case can only apply to the Latin annals.[47]

Apart from this our knowledge of the work's structure depends almost entirely on a much-discussed statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (T12), who says that Fabius

[42] This comparison has frequently been made, but is given particular prominence by Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 61; *Classical Foundations* (1990), 98; and recently by Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 1–23.

[43] On the nature of the historical tradition before Fabius, especially its oral component, see now J. von Ungern-Sternberg, in J. von Ungern-Sternberg, H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Stuttgart, 1988), 237–65; D. Timpe, ibid. 266–86; T. P. Wiseman, *Historiography and Imagination*, 32–6 (and *passim*); Beck–Walter 1. 27–37; Scholz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 145–6.

[44] Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 61.

[45] W. Soltau, *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leipzig, 1909), 78–9; Peter 1. lxxv–lxxvi; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 31–2; Badian, 'Early historians', 3.

[46] J. N. Adams in *ALLP* 73–4; cf. Briscoe, ibid. 58.

[47] Those who have made the attempt include von Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 5. 515; Beloch, *RG* 100; Verbrugghe, *Studi . . . Manni* 6 (1980), 2168. Their conclusions are summarized by Chassignet 1. lxvi–ii, n. 256.

and Cincius (Alimentus) wrote in detail (*ἀκριβῶς*) about the period in which they themselves lived, but dealt summarily (*κεφαλαιωδῶς*) with the early events after the foundation of the city. This may mean that the earlier history was skipped over in just a few pages; but that is not a necessary assumption. Dionysius could equally well imply that the first five centuries of Roman history occupied less space (even if they filled several books) than the few decades that Fabius himself had lived through. Dionysius' words would be perfectly compatible with a work in which four or five books (say) were devoted to the period down to the First Punic War, and twice that number to the age of the Punic Wars themselves. We may compare the procedure of Polybius, who contrasted his main narrative, beginning in book 3 with the events of 220 BC, with his introductory books, which were written *κεφαλαιωδῶς*.[48]

The important point, as Frier has argued, is that Dionysius makes this remark in the context of a wider justification for his own treatment of the 'archaeologia' of Rome—that is, his highly elaborate and rhetorical account of Roman history before the Punic Wars, an account that filled twenty books.[49] Even in his day, Dionysius says, the Greeks were ignorant of Rome's earliest history, because no full-length treatment of the subject existed in their language. Greek historians had only touched on the period, and even the early Roman historians who wrote in Greek (i.e. Fabius, Cincius, *et al.*) did not cover it adequately. That is the argument of which T12 forms a part. In other words, Fabius and Cincius were deficient by Dionysius' own standard; but his notorious prolixity, and the tendentious thrust of the whole passage, should warn us not to infer that Fabius' account of Rome's early history was only a brief sketch. The fragments, on the contrary, suggest a fair amount of detail.

Most recent commentators, however, have used T12 to support a rather different interpretation of the overall shape of Fabius Pictor's history. Dionysius says that Fabius and Cincius dealt summarily with the early events 'after the foundation of the city'. This formulation could be taken to mean that the foundation itself, and the events leading up to it, were treated more fully, and that the summarizing started only after the foundation had been dealt with. This has given rise to the widely-held theory that Fabius' history was shaped like an egg-timer or 'hour-glass'—that is, expanded at either end, and constricted in the middle.

There may well be something in this, in the sense that the origins of cities and peoples was a topic of abiding interest for Greek historians, and that a special literary category of 'foundations' (*κτίσεις*) emerged in the Hellenistic period.[50] The study of foundations and origins extended beyond the borders of the Greek world, and included barbarian peoples and cities; if there was one aspect of the Roman past in which the Greeks had taken an interest, it was the city's foundation legend. The origins of Rome had been discussed by Greek historians since the fifth century, and were of particular interest to historians of the West, especially Timaeus. Plutarch tells us (F4b) that Fabius Pictor drew upon a full account of the foundation of Rome

[48] Pol. 1.13.7; 2.1.4; cf. 2.14.1, 40.4; Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 16.

[49] Frier, *Libri Annales*, 257; also Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 14–15; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 101–2.

[50] B. Schmid, *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen* (Diss. Freiburg i. ü., 1947); Bickerman, *CPh* 47 (1952), 65–81; Cornell, *RAC* 12. 1108–11. For historians notice esp. Pol. 9.1.4, with Walbank ad loc.

(*κτίσις Ῥώμης*) by Diocles of Peparethos. It could well be that Fabius was able to write at greater length about the legendary origins of the city, on which he could find abundant material in Greek sources, and about his own age, than about the intervening archaic period, which was poorly documented in comparison; an hour-glass shape resulted because that was the shape of the existing picture of the Roman past in Greek historical accounts.[51] It has also been argued that it is characteristic of oral tradition in general.[52]

On these general grounds, then, it is possible that Fabius's account was fuller on the origins and on contemporary events than on the period in between. This has been widely accepted, and the 'hour-glass' analogy is now a scholarly commonplace.[53] Nevertheless, some reservations are in order. In the first place, the key passage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in T12 offers no positive support for the theory. Dionysius does not say that the foundation story (the *κτίσις*) was treated more fully than what followed. What he says does not rule it out, however, and his wording, if pressed, could even be said to point to such an interpretation. But it hardly amounts to positive evidence, and it remains possible that he meant simply that Fabius gave a summary account of the early history from the start, and wrote more expansively as the story reached his own lifetime.[54]

Secondly, the frequency and relative length of surviving quotations might seem to support the hour-glass theory. A considerable portion of the fragmentary text we possess is concerned with the foundation legend, which might suggest therefore that Fabius treated it at some length; on the other hand the early republican period down to the Punic Wars, particularly the fifth and fourth centuries, is barely represented in the surviving fragments.[55] But this argument is weak, because the fragments that survive are not a random or representative sample of the original text. It cannot be stressed too often or too strongly that the preserved fragments of any lost ancient author are a biased sample reflecting, wholly and exclusively, the interests and

[51] See Gabba's fundamental study, 'Tradizione letteraria', 135–74, esp. 135–8.

[52] J. von Ungern-Sternberg, in J. von Ungern-Sternberg, H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Stuttgart, 1988), 247–9; D. Timpe, ibid. 276–7.

[53] The tripartite 'hour-glass' structure is accepted by the following (among others): Schanz, *GRL* 1². 120; Münzer, *RE* 6. 1839; Peter 1. lxii–lxxiv; Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933), 258; Gelzer, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 129; 82 (1954), 343 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 77, 146); Knoche, *NJAB* 2 (1939), 200 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 232); Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 17–18; Bung, *Q. Fabius Pictor* (1950), 201; Bömer, *Historia* 2 (1953–4), 199–200; Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 165 (=Pöschl, *RGS* 307); Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 63; C. P. T. Naudé, *AClass* 4 (1961), 53; Badian, 'Early historians', 3; Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria', 135–8; Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 932–40; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 9–10; Verbrugghe in *Studi . . . Manni* 6 (1980), 2167; Petzold in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius* (1993), 161–9; D'Ippolito, *A&R* 43 (1998), 146; Scholz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 141; Beck–Walter 1. 61; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 402–3; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 362. The 'hour-glass' idea has also made its way into standard works of reference, e.g. Brennan, *Praetorship*, 6–7.

[54] Schanz–Hosius (1². 172) infer that Fabius' work was divided into two parts: a brief summary of early history and a detailed account of recent events. Similar reservations are expressed by Vitucci, *Helikon* 6 (1966), 409; Poucet, *Historia* 25 (1976), 212–14; Chassignet 1. lxviii–lxix. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 255–8 (followed by Dillery, in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 15) invokes Jacoby, *Atthis*, 285 n. 75 in an attempt to minimize the effect of DH's statement, and to deny that Fabius' work was divided into identifiable narrative sections. He is taken to task by Petzold (in Schuller (ed.), *Livius* (1993), 161, 184 n. 63), who upholds the orthodox view.

[55] Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria', 135–6; Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 937–8; Verbrugghe, *Studi . . . Manni* (1980), 2169–73.

concerns of the secondary authors who quote them. For this reason the content, frequency, and distribution of preserved quotations should never be regarded as any sort of guide to the form, content, or structure of a lost historical work.[56]

In fact the distribution of the fragments of Fabius Pictor resembles that of all the other lost republican historians, and in almost all cases the result is the inverse of the true balance of the original work. It seems that all histories of Rome from the origins, including surviving examples such as Livy, expanded in scope as they reached the author's own time, and in all of them recent and contemporary events occupied a disproportionately large amount of space.[57] The surviving fragments of their works, however, are overwhelmingly concerned with the period of the legendary origins of the city, and Fabius Pictor is no exception. On a rough calculation, over 50 per cent of the surviving 'text' of Pictor deals with events before the foundation, around 70 per cent with the pre-republican age.[58] The evidence does not suggest an hour-glass, but an inverted pyramid, and a top-heavy one at that. The explanation for this has to do with the interests and concerns of the citing authorities; as pointed out, the relative frequency of citations cannot be used to reconstruct the economy of the original work.

This argument also serves to undermine an influential version of the 'hour-glass' theory, according to which Fabius wrote at length about not only the foundation legend, but also the monarchic period and the beginning of the republic, down to the Twelve Tables in the mid-fifth century. The case was made in detail by D. Timpe, who observed that a number of other writers, including Polybius, Cato, Cicero, and Diodorus, also paid particular attention to this period, and highlighted the Decemvirate and the Valerio-Horatian Laws of 449 BC as marking the end of a formative stage in the development of the Roman state.[59] According to Timpe, this tradition went back to Fabius, who included the whole of this period in his account of the foundation (*κτίσις*) of the city.

In this way Timpe is able to reconcile his reconstruction of the shape of Fabius' work with Dionysius' statement in T12 that he wrote summarily about the period after the *κτίσις*—that is, on Timpe's view, the period from around 450 to the early third century. It has to be said, however, that this is an impossible interpretation of the text. There is no evidence that Dionysius, or any other author, ever thought of the *κτίσις* in that way; on the contrary, it is perfectly clear that Dionysius understood the *κτίσις* to be the foundation of the city by Romulus, and he never used the term to

[56] Thus, rightly, Vitucci, *Helikon* 6 (1966), 409–10; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 362; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 102.

[57] Cato (5) devoted four out of seven books to the period from the First Punic War to his own time, and Piso (9) probably did something similar; Claudius Quadrigarius (24) dealt with Cannae in the fifth of his twenty-three or more books. Valerius Antias (25), who wrote at least seventy five, apparently dealt with an event of 136 BC in book 22, while Livy devoted seventy-one of his 142 books (i.e. the second half) to the period after 91 BC.

[58] The calculation is based on the amount of text in Greek or Latin that we have printed as 'fragments'. This is a crude measure, but the results are overwhelming. If the long description of the *ludi magni* (F14–15) is included, then over 90% of what survives deals with the period down to 490 BC.

[59] Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 938–40, accepted by Beck–Walter 1. 61. See also Gelzer, *Gnomon* 28 (1956), 85 (=*Kl. Schr.* 3, 196); Kierdorf, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 212–13; Cornell in J. G. F. Powell, J. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic* (London 2001), 46–7.

mean anything else.[60] The point can be adequately made by two passages in which he cites Fabius Pictor, and which are printed here as F5a and F6: in F5a he says that Fabius dated the foundation (the *κτίσις*) to the first year of the eighth Olympiad (i.e. 748/7 BC), and in F6 he quotes Fabius' opinion that the rape of the Sabine women occurred in the fourth month after the foundation (*μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν*).[61]

This discussion prompts the following conclusions. The shape and economy of Fabius' history cannot be reconstructed from the surviving fragments, which give a wholly misleading picture of the original. From Dionysius, whom we have no reason to disbelieve, we learn that Fabius and Cincius devoted more space to recent and contemporary events than to the preceding history—the inverse, therefore, of the impression created by the surviving fragments. Dionysius says that Fabius and Cincius treated the early period summarily (*κεφαλαιωδῶς*), but this is a relative term: we are entitled to infer only that the early period was treated summarily compared with their narrative of the Punic Wars on the one hand, and with Dionysius' long-winded treatment of the early centuries on the other. This still leaves scope for a reasonable breadth of treatment: the fragments make it clear that Fabius did not stint on details, and F31, if attributed to Pictor, would indicate that the Latin version, at least, needed four books to reach the year 366 BC. On the other hand there is nothing to suggest that the early legends were treated more fully than the period after the founding of the city; and while Fabius may have regarded the period down to the Decemvirate as an important formative stage in the city's development, there is no proof that he did, and no evidence that he treated it more fully than the succeeding republican period.

There has been much discussion of the layout of the work, and particularly the question of whether the material was arranged annalistically, as in later historians. The fact that the work is called *annales* by some sources is of no significance in this regard; by Cicero's day the term was a synonym for history. In any case the original title would have been in Greek, and is unlikely to have given any clue to the arrangement of the contents.[62] The direct evidence of the fragments does not allow the question to be answered conclusively. F18 might suggest a year-by-year arrangement, at least for that part of the narrative (294 BC); on the other hand F31 would be compatible with an episodic structure, with events dated by intervals, rather than every year being recorded under the names of the consuls. Both methods are possible, if we assume that more recent events (let us say from the Samnite Wars onwards) were treated annalistically, and the earlier period selectively, in the way that Polybius did for events before the First Punic War (1.6–7; 2. 18–21), or Thucydides in the

[60] Thus, rightly, Poucet, *Historia* 25 (1976), 214; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 403–4; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 102. Timpe's notion (*ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 935–6; already in *ALP* 83 (1970–71), 17; cf. Badian, 'Early historians', 8) that a Greek literary *Ktisis* typically included some of the early history of a city, as well as the actual foundation, has no support in the evidence.

[61] Cf. Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 102, with further examples. As Northwood rightly observes, the point at issue is not what *κτίσις* might have meant to Fabius, but what it meant to DH.

[62] Cicero calls the work *Graeci annales* in T10 (=F1)—a unique reference. Pliny calls it simply *annales* (F20, 25), as does Gellius (T17), while Nonius calls it *res gestae* (F40). The Greek title was probably *Ῥωμαικά* (thus, DH 7.71.1=F15). Diodorus' *Ῥωμαίων πράξεις* (F3) is probably a description of the work, rather than a title. For the implications of these titles/descriptions see Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 110–11; and cf. 98–9 on the meaning of the term 'annalist'; on which see also Verbrugghe, *Studi . . . Manni* (1980), 2165 n. 10.

'pentecontaetia' (1.89–118). But there is no positive evidence for this theory, and the arguments used by Gelzer in its support are misconceived.[63] Although the debate cannot be conclusively settled on the evidence we have, it seems safer to regard Fabius as an 'annalist', if only because Cicero seems to imply it in T8–9, and because Cato 5 F81 suggests criticism of predecessors who had reproduced the content of the pontifical chronicle in their works.[64]

Although Fabius has been compared to historians such as Berossus and Manetho, who reacted against what Greek historians had written about their native countries (respectively, Babylonia and Egypt), and aimed to correct their 'false' opinions, Fabius seems to have been much more thoroughly Hellenized.[65] He and his Roman successors wholeheartedly embraced a Greek perspective and accepted what Greek authors had said about the past of Rome. The most remarkable example of this is the statement of Plutarch (T16=F4b) implying that Fabius' account of the story of Romulus and Remus followed that of Diocles of Peparethos.

This is a highly problematic text, both because we know so little about Diocles of Peparethos[66] and because it is not clear how Plutarch's words are to be interpreted. While he could mean no more than that Diocles was the first to publish among the Greeks the standard version of the legend, the one that Fabius followed in most essentials (taking *λόγου* as the antecedent of *ᾧ*),[67] the alternative interpretation is a far more natural reading of the passage, and surely closer to what Plutarch intended – namely that the most probable version of the story was first published among the Greeks by Diocles, who was followed in most essentials by Fabius (taking *Διοκλῆς* as the antecedent of *ᾧ*—as in our translation). Although it is unthinkable that Fabius had to rely exclusively on Diocles for information about the foundation story, Plutarch's statement must mean that Diocles' version was similar to that of Fabius, who had known of it and had probably referred to it with approval in his text.[68] We cannot know how much, if any, of Plutarch's account of the twins went back to Diocles, any more than we can attribute any of its details specifically to Fabius (see comm. on F4). The same must be true of the literary character of the fragment: those scholars who argue that 'tragic' features of the account were introduced by Diocles go well beyond what the evidence actually permits us to infer.

[63] Gelzer's case (*Kl. Schr.* 3. 93–110) rests on a series of question-begging assumptions: (a) that Sempronius Asellio 20 F1 was distinguishing between 'senatorial historians', from Fabius to Cato, and 'annalists', who came later and wrote in Latin (on this see Jacoby, *Atthis*, 285 n. 75); (b) that Cicero's references to Fabius in T8–9 are in fact to the Latin annals, which Gelzer takes to have been a different work; (c) that Fabius set out to justify Roman policy to the Greeks, and that an annalistic chronicle of the early republic would have been wholly unsuitable for this purpose; and (d) that Polybius' summaries (1.6–7; 2.18–21) of Roman history before the First Punic War are not only based on Fabius, but also adopt the format of his text.

[64] Thus Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 15–18; Bömer, *Historia* 2 (1953–4), 198–204; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 269–84; Oakley, *Comm.* 4. 475–7; Rich, 'Structuring Roman History', 134–6. For discussion of the whole issue see Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 97–114.

[65] Thus Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 19–23.

[66] Apart from the Plutarch passage, the only thing we know about Diocles is that his death was alluded to by Demetrius of Scepsis (*ap.* Athen. 2.22=*FGrHist* 820 T1), who was writing in the first half of the second century BC. Jacoby assumes that *κτίσις Ῥώμης* was the title of a work by Diocles (*FGrHist* 820 F1), but this is not a legitimate inference from Plutarch's text.

[67] Peter 1. lxxxii–lxxxiii.

[68] Thus Mommsen, cited by Momigliano, *Secondo contributo*, 403; Frier, *Libri Annales*, 260.

This is not to say, however, that Fabius did not use Greek sources more widely. Indeed it is probable that he did so, and made extensive use especially of Timaeus, who wrote about the earlier history of Rome in his account of the Pyrrhic War as well as in his general history of the West (DH 1.6.1=*FGrHist* 566 T9b). Although direct dependence cannot be conclusively proved in any given instance, many of the fragments of Fabius are reminiscent of the interests, methods, and outlook of Timaeus,[69] and in general Timaeus is frequently, and rightly, seen as an indispensable source of both information and inspiration for the first Roman historians.

But Fabius' sources will also have included documents and archives, as well as native oral traditions, that would not have been available, or indeed of much interest, to Greek historians and their readers. The *Annales Maximi* and other priestly records, lists of magistrates and triumphs, family archives and traditions, and other materials of the same kind would have been freely available to Fabius as a member of the ruling aristocracy, and material from such sources was undoubtedly incorporated into his account, even if we cannot be certain what the end result was exactly like. For example whether it contained a complete list of consuls going back to the beginning of the republic is unknown and much disputed; but there is little doubt that it could have done so, and we are inclined to believe that it did.[70]

One outstanding example of Fabius' use of documentary sources is the muster of Italian forces at the time of the Gallic invasion of 225 BC. Polybius tells us that the Romans instructed their allies to provide lists of men of military age (2.23.9), and proceeds (2.24) to break down the resulting totals to provide a global figure of 700,000 infantry and 70,000 cavalry. Similar figures appear in Diodorus (25 fr.13) and Pliny (*nat.* 3.138, but giving 80,000 cavalry instead of 70,000), while sources dependent on Livy (*per.* 20; Eutrop. 3.5; Oros. 4.13.6–7) give a round figure of 800,000 for the total. These figures are close enough to one another to make it certain that they go back to a common source—a common source that is identified by Eutropius and Orosius as Fabius Pictor (F21a–b). But it is also extremely probable, as Mommsen recognized,[71] that Polybius' detailed breakdown of the figures also comes from Fabius; this would be likely enough in any case, but the evidence of Eutropius and Orosius makes it virtually certain, especially in view of Orosius' additional comment, in which the numbers are divided between Romans and allies.[72]

Fabius' account of Roman and Italian manpower in 225 BC represents a conflation of the figures for military forces actually serving in 225 (perhaps from the archives of the senate), the recorded census totals (for Romans capable of bearing arms), and an official record of the figures that were returned by the various allied states (Pol. 2.23.9:

[69] See esp. Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 101: 'He (*sc.* Timaeus) gave Fabius the taste for the happy turn of phrase, for the significant anecdote, for the antiquarian detail, and perhaps even for the autobiographical elements.'

[70] The extreme revisionism of scholars such as J. Rüpke (*Klio* 77 (1995), 184–202; *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit* (Berlin, 1995), 331–68) and E. Mora (*Fasti e schemi cronologici. La riorganizzazione annalistica del passato remoto romano* (Stuttgart, 1999)), who believe that the consular list did not exist in Fabius' time, but was fabricated by historians and antiquarians in the second century, seems to us both improbable and insufficiently based in the evidence. For a critical assessment see J.-C. Richard, *REL* 79 (2001), 19–25; Northwood in *Carolla Rodewald* (2007), 108–9.

[71] *RF* 2. 383–4.

[72] We have therefore highlighted this sentence in bold in F21b.

ἀπογραφαί; cf. 2.24.10: *καταγραφαί*).[73] In other words we have the clearest possible evidence that Fabius did first-hand research using material available from archival sources. A wider interest in questions of military manpower is also attested by F10, and a liking for facts and figures perhaps by F9 and F12.

Another body of material to which Fabius would have had privileged access was the records of his own family, in the form of oral tradition as well as documents and physical memorials. The surviving accounts contain an exceptionally rich seam of stories about the Fabii, both as individuals and as a clan, and there must be a good chance that some of these were brought into the historiographical tradition by Fabius Pictor. The Fabii traced their origins back to Hercules, who featured in Pictor's account of the foundation legend, as we now know from the Tauromenium inscription (T7). The fact that one of the two groups of *luperci* were known as *luperci Fabi(an)i* also suggests that they were important at the time of Romulus, but it is striking that in the surviving accounts of the foundation and the regal period more generally the ancestors of the Fabii play no part (the same is true of the other major patrician clans). This is taken by Momigliano as evidence of Fabius Pictor's honesty;[74] it is in any case a sign that Fabius and his successors did not try to rewrite the earliest history of the city in the interests of family pride.

The history of the republic, on the other hand, is replete with episodes from the family tradition of the Fabii. The famous story of their private war against the Etruscans, and its fatal conclusion at the Cremera in 477 BC, is a case in point.[75] They were also intimately linked to the tradition of the Gallic catastrophe, which was caused by the rashness of the three Fabii who were sent to Clusium to negotiate with the Gauls, but then joined the Clusines in a battle against them;[76] another famous story was the exploit of C. Fabius Dorsuo, who sneaked out of the beleaguered Capitol and through enemy lines in order to carry out an annual festival of the Fabian *gens* on the Quirinal.[77] In the twenty-second year after this, according to Fabius, if he is the author of F30, the first plebeian consul took office; this was the result of the

[73] As argued by K. J. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Leipzig, 1886), 355–70. See also Mommsen, *RF* 2. 382–406; M. Gelzer, *Hermes* 70 (1935), 273–5 (=*Kl. Schr.* 3. 224–6=Pöschl, *RGS*, 150–61); A. Afzelius, *Die römische Eroberung Italiens* (Copenhagen, 1942), 98–101; Walbank, *Comm.* 1. 196–203; A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy* (London, 1966), 1. 479–505; Brunt, *IM* 44–60.

[74] Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 105; cf. *Quarto contributo*, 489.

[75] Principal sources: Livy 2.48.8–50.11; DH 9.15.2–7, 18.5–22.6; Diod. 11.53.6; Ov. *fast.* 2.193–242; Gell. 17.21.13; Fest. 358; Paul. Fest. 451; *Lib. de praen.* 6. Discussion in Mommsen, *RF* 2. 246–61 (esp. 256–7: Fabian family tradition transmitted via Pictor); E. Pais, *Storia di Roma* 1.1 (Turin, 1898), 434–6, 515–21; id., *Ancient Legends*, 168–84 (esp. 172–8: the whole story fabricated as a reprojection of an event in 358 BC: Livy 7.15.10); Ogilvie, *Comm.* 359–66; and the important studies of J.-C. Richard, *Latomus* 47 (1988), 526–53; 48 (1989), 312–25 (taking it for granted that the story was in Fabius Pictor).

[76] Livy 5.35.5–36.11; App. *Celt.* 2–3; DH 13.12 (with two Fabii rather than three). Diodorus (14.113.3–7) does not name the ambassadors (cf. Dio fr. 25.2), which prompted Mommsen to suggest that the Fabii were introduced at a later stage in the development of the tradition (*RF* 2. 303–7). Ogilvie argued that this secondary version was the work of Fabius Pictor (*Comm.* 716), which is rather paradoxical, especially as Livy's version is hostile to the Fabii (NB esp. 5.35.1 *mitis legatio, ni praeferoces legatos Gallisque magis quam Romanis similes habuisset*, 'a peaceful embassy, if it had not consisted of headstrong ambassadors more like Gauls than Romans'). But see further below.

[77] Livy 5.46.1–3, 52.3; Val. Max. 1.1.11; App. *Gall.* 6 (=?Cassius Hemina (6) F22); Dio fr. 25.5–6. Cf. C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan* (Cambridge, 2006), 45–6, comparing DH 9.19.1, stressing the fact that the Fabii are represented at key moments in history as especially tightly bound to their own festivals, and invoking Fabius Pictor.

'Licinio-Sextian Rogations', a reform movement that lasted ten years and started, according to Livy, because of an incident in the house of M. Fabius Ambustus. The story, a kind of soap opera, involved the rivalry between Fabius' two daughters, one of whom was married to a patrician, the other to a plebeian. The complaints of the second daughter induced Fabius to support the plebeians' struggle to achieve equality between the orders.[78]

The next set of examples concerns the career of Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, the historian's great-uncle. Two episodes in particular stand out: the first is the dispute between Rullianus and Papirius Cursor, which we know was narrated by Fabius Pictor (F17); the second is the reconnaissance mission of Caeso Fabius, the brother of the consul Rullianus (and therefore another of Pictor's great-uncles), who in 311 BC made his way through the trackless Ciminian Forest to Camerinum in Umbria, which he persuaded to become an ally of Rome. The story is notable for its family-based circumstantial detail. The interesting feature is not so much the fact that the consul appointed his brother for the task, as his reasons for doing so. Livy explains that the brother had been brought up in Caere and spoke fluent Etruscan; he was therefore able to undertake the hazardous expedition disguised as a peasant and accompanied only by a slave.[79]

Two features of these stories deserve attention. First, each one of them has a familial aspect. This is obvious in the case of the Cremera, the exploit of Fabius Dorsuo, the daughters of Fabius Ambustus, and the expedition of Caeso Fabius through the Ciminian Forest. But we may also note Diodorus' account (14.113.6–7) of the role played by the father of the Fabii at the time of the embassy to Clusium, and the similar intervention by M. Ambustus, the father of Rullianus, who appealed to the tribunes of the plebs on behalf of his son during the dispute with Papirius Cursor in 325 (Livy 8.30–6).[80] This episode too, at least in Livy's account, is turned into a family affair. It seems inherently probable that all these stories formed part of a family tradition of the *gens Fabia*, in which members of the clan played key roles at major turning points in the history of the city; and the most reasonable explanation of the prominence of these stories in the surviving sources must be that they were brought into the historiographical tradition by Fabius Pictor.

If so we must also assume that Pictor's account showed the second characteristic feature of what we may call the Fabian tradition, namely the fact that it is not invariably favourable to the Fabii. This is especially evident in the story that we know was in Fabius Pictor, namely the dispute between Fabius Rullianus and his commander, the dictator Papirius Cursor. Pictor made it brutally clear (F17) that Rullianus burned the booty in order to prevent the dictator from using it to adorn his

[78] Livy 6.34.5–11; Dio fr. 29; Zonar. 7.24. On the story see Cornell in *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano* (Como, 1983), 114–15; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 646–7.

[79] Livy 9.36.2–9; also Frontin. *strat.* 1.2.2 (probably from Livy). The anecdote does not occur in the parallel narrative of Diod. 20.35.1–5 or in the fragments of Dio. On the difficulty in Livy's text see Oakley, *Comm.* ad loc. Possible derivation from Fabius Pictor: Cornell, *Beginnings*, 355–6.

[80] There may be some duplication here, as the stories have a very similar structure, and in Livy the father of the three Fabii who fought at Clusium is named M. Fabius Ambustus (5.35.5), who is otherwise unknown, unless he is to be identified with M. Fabius Vibulanus (cos. 442) (cf. Ogilvie, *Comm.* 716, ad loc.). The doublet (if such it is) may already have been inherent in the family's own tradition—that is to say, the family may have claimed a proud record of fathers intervening to save their headstrong sons.

own triumph; and as for the dispute itself, Oakley has demonstrated that Rullianus was definitely in the wrong, although the reader is evidently meant to sympathize with him.[81] Here and elsewhere we find the young Fabii presented as reckless and headstrong, but at the same time heroic: at the Cremera they allow success to go to their heads, and are lured into an ambush (Livy 2.50.3–6; DH 9.20.1–3; Ov. *fast.* 2.213–34), while at Clusium one of the brothers engages with the enemy chief and slays him in single combat (Diod. 14.113.5; Livy 5.36.7; DH 13.12.1; App. *Celt.* 2), thus achieving glory for himself and disaster for Rome; on the other hand the older generation pleads for moderation and seeks resolution (thus M. Fabius Ambustus on behalf of his daughter in the 370s, and his namesake on behalf of his son in 325). One can easily see why Fabius Pictor might have taken this line in his history, and how it might have fitted in with his presentation of his great contemporary, Fabius Cunctator.

However probable this reconstruction may be, little of it is capable of proof, and in accordance with our general principles (see General Introduction, I. 15–16) we have printed as fragments only explicitly attributed passages. But it calls to mind the general point that the surviving sources are likely to preserve far more of the lost historians than they openly acknowledge; and that the passages we have been discussing must be considered together with other texts that are undoubtedly based, at least in part, on Fabius Pictor. These include Polybius' account of the Gallic invasions of Italy in book 2, and much of his narrative of the First Punic War in book 1. Mommsen's famous theory that the Roman sections of Diodorus 11–20 are taken directly from Fabius Pictor is now discredited,[82] but there are other possible examples. These include the anonymous historical fragment known as the *Ineditum Vaticanum*, containing a speech by a Roman named Caeso at the time of the First Punic War. At this date the *praenomen* Caeso was used exclusively by the Fabii; the speaker was therefore a Fabius, which led the first editor of the fragment to attribute it to Fabius Pictor.[83] Many other passages could be, and have been, traced back to Fabius with greater or lesser degrees of probability; but in general we have to reckon with the fact that many of the basic elements of the history of Rome down to the Second Punic War are likely to have featured, even if briefly and in rudimentary form, in the pioneering account of the historian who first established the tradition of historical writing at Rome.[84]

(EHB, TJC)

[81] Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 704–7. On the burning of the booty cf. Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 103.

[82] *RF* 2. 221–96.

[83] H. von Arnim, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 118–30, at 130. The text is reproduced also as *FGrHist* 839 F1. Similar passages, evidently drawn from the same source, occur at Diod. 23.2.1 and Athenaeus 6.273. Derivation from Fabius is suggested also by Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.2. 445–6, and Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 105. *Contra*: Badian, 'Early historians', 30 n. 26.

[84] 'The immense influence of Fabius Pictor is accepted by virtually all modern historians, regardless of whether they believe that he collected and shaped a pre-existing tradition (the majority view, to which we subscribe), or that he freely invented much of it, and passed on his fabrications to succeeding generations of Roman historians (which is the position adopted by A. Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 123–75, and *passim*).

2

L. Cincius Alimentus

Editions: Peter 1[2]. ci–cxvi, 40–3; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 810; Chassignet 1. lxxiii–lxxix, 54–9; Beck–Walter 1. 137–47; T. Hlabinek, *BNJ* 810.

Principal discussions: M. J. Hertz, *De Luciis Cinciis* (Berlin, 1842); T. Mommsen, *Röm. Chron.*[2] (1859), 315–19; F. Münzer, C. Cichorius, 'L. Cincius (5) Alimentus', *RE* 3 (1899), 2556–7; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 174–6; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 30–2; Frier, *Libri Annales* (1979), 206, 238; G. P. Verbrugghe, 'L. Cincius Alimentus—his place in Roman historiography', *Philologus* 126 (1982), 316–23; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 370–2.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The historian L. Cincius Alimentus was a contemporary of Fabius Pictor and lived at the time of the Punic Wars (T2); the most interesting fact about him is that he was taken prisoner by Hannibal (T1). It is generally assumed that he is to be identified with the L. Cincius Alimentus who was praetor in 210 BC (Livy 26.23.1). The identification is probable, given DH's statement (T3) that the historian was a senator, and the fact that no other L. Cincius is known from this period.[1]

If he was praetor in 210, we can fix his date of birth in the years around 250 BC.[2] His earlier career is unknown, but between his election to the praetorship in 211 and his last dated appearance in 208 he appears several times in Livy's narrative. As praetor, and then with propraetorian *imperium*, he served for three years (210–208 BC) in Sicily under M. Valerius Laevinus (cos. 210, procos. 209–208).[3] We may note in passing that this would have been a suitable appointment for a man who knew Greek, which gives further weight to the identification with the historian. In 208 he crossed to Italy and laid siege to Locri, but was beaten off by Hannibal, who had himself been repulsed from Salapia after the death of the consul Marcellus (Livy 27.28.13–17). Cincius then

[1] The historian's *cognomen* is given only by Livy (T1, F5) and in the dubious F11. Dionysius characteristically refers to him simply as Cincius (F3, F4) or L. Cincius (T2, F2). The other known Cincii of the time are C. Cincius, a plebeian aedile probably of third-century date (*FLLRP* 449; *MRR* 2. 467), P. Cincius, a *legatus* in 217 (Livy 22.31.6, accepting Hertz's emendation of *Circi* in the Puteanus), and M. Cincius Alimentus, tr. pl. 204 (Livy 29.20.11), who may have been the historian's brother as well as the author of a law on gifts (G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan, 1912), 261–3): thus Peter 1. ci.

[2] It may have been earlier than 250, or indeed later, since a minimum age for the senior magistracies seems not to have been enforced before the *lex Villia* of 180 BC (Mommsen, *Staatsr.* 1[3]. 563–5), but it must have fallen in the 250s or 240s.

[3] Livy 26.28.3 (Cincius assigned to Sicily to assist the consul Laevinus); 26.28.11 (given command of the *milites Cannenses*, the soldiers who had survived the battle of Cannae); 27.5.1 (Laevinus returns to Rome, leaving Cincius in charge of Sicily); 27.7.12 (the *imperium* of Laevinus and Cincius in Sicily prorogued for 209); 27.8.16 (Laevinus puts Cincius in charge of the former kingdom of Hiero); 27.26.3 (the consuls of 208 order Cincius to cross to Italy to besiege Locri).

returned to Rome, whereupon the senate appointed him an envoy, with two others, to the surviving consul T. Quinctius Crispinus to urge the appointment of a dictator (Livy 27.29.4–5). That is the last we hear of Cincius, which led Peter to suspect that it was during the course of his embassy to Crispinus that he was captured by Hannibal; Peter rightly notes that the other envoys, Sex. Julius Caesar (who was praetor in 208) and L. Licinius Pollio, also vanish from the record, and infers that they too may have been taken prisoner.[4]

During his captivity Cincius was able to speak to Hannibal in person, probably in Greek (cf. Nepos *Hann.* 13.2–3, and comm. on F5), and to obtain information from him which he subsequently incorporated in his history (T1, F5). It follows that he wrote after his captivity, which probably ended in 202 under the terms of the peace treaty after Zama, providing for the release of all prisoners (Livy 30.37.3). A more precise date of composition cannot be established, but we can be reasonably certain that he wrote after Fabius Pictor, who is described by Livy and Dionysius as the earliest historian of all (Fabius (1) T11a, c, d).

Work

Dionysius tells us in T2 that Cincius wrote in Greek, and both there and elsewhere (F1–3) brackets him with his elder contemporary Fabius Pictor. The same text also makes it clear that his work had the same scope and structure as Pictor's, namely that it narrated the events of the author's lifetime in detail, but gave a summary account of the earlier period 'after the foundation of the city' (on this phrase and its implications see introduction to Fabius (1)). The certainly attested fragments extend from the foundation legend to Hannibal's march to Italy in 218 BC (F5).

How far the narrative continued after that we do not know, but it is possible that Cincius did not live to complete his account of the Hannibalic War. We noted above that Fabius Pictor's account may not have covered all of the war, as he seems no longer to have been available to Livy for the years 212 and 204 (introduction to Fabius I. 167 and n. 32); but the same argument ought equally to apply to Cincius.[5] It is indeed surprising that our sources make no reference to Cincius for events after 218 BC, especially if he had written an extensive account of his own experiences in the war;[6] above all one would have expected him to make use of the information that was uniquely available to him, namely the oral testimony of his Carthaginian captors, and especially that of Hannibal himself. We must conclude either that this material was taken from Cincius by later historians without acknowledgement and absorbed into the tradition, or that for some reason (most obviously because death intervened) he was unable to write it down and publish it.

As it is, the evidence suggests that Cincius' history was almost completely overshadowed by the work of Fabius. He is nowhere mentioned by Polybius, even if 'he

[4] Peter 1. ccii; cf. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 238. Peter rightly scouted Niebuhr's idea (*Hist. Rom.* 1. 273) that Cincius was captured at the beginning of the war.

[5] D. Hoyos, *ZPE* 134 (2001), 78. Hoyos's conclusion is that both Fabius and Cincius covered the whole of the Second Punic War. Our tentative suggestion, on the contrary, is that neither of them did.

[6] Livy's references to Cincius as a participant in events (n. 3) show no sign of being based on autopsy; the longest passage (Livy 27.28.13–17) deals with Cincius' defeat at Locri and does not exculpate him.

will hardly have been overlooked' by him.[7] Dionysius, who did read him, twice reports that he gave the same account as Fabius (F1, F3, and cf. comm. on F4). Otherwise, apart from Livy's reference to his report of Hannibal's testimony (F5), we know only that he gave a peculiar date for the foundation of the city (F2) and a distinctive account of the death of Sp. Maelius (F4); in this he may have been followed by Piso (9 F27), who would in that case be the only other historian known to have read him.

At this point we have reached the limit of what can be learned from the testimonia and fragments that unequivocally refer to the historian Cincius Alimentus. A large number of other texts, however, mention a writer named L. Cincius, but there is more than a suspicion that some or all of these refer to a different person altogether. Most of these references occur in antiquarian writings, especially Festus, and are mostly themselves of antiquarian character. Many are attributed to specific works: *De uerbis priscis* (Fest. 236, 322, 342, 444), *De comitiis* (Fest. 277), *De fastis* (Macrob. 1.12.12), *Mystagogica* (Fest 498), *De consulum potestate* (Fest. 276), *De officio iurisconsulti* (Fest. 176, 427–8), *De re militari* (Gell. 16.4.6); a great many others of the same kind are cited by these and other sources and ascribed simply to Cincius, or L. Cincius.[8]

For the past two centuries it has been recognized that these quotations, from works evidently written in Latin, cannot be attributed to a man who lived at the time of Hannibal and wrote a history in Greek.[9] The case for a second Cincius, an antiquarian of the first century BC, was made conclusively by Hertz in 1842, and has been universally accepted ever since.[10] The date of the antiquarian L. Cincius is disputed; Hertz, followed by Mommsen, placed him under Augustus,[11] but others make him a contemporary of Cicero and Varro.[12] A L. Cincius appears in Cicero's correspondence as a confidential agent of Atticus,[13] but it is extremely unlikely that, if he were the learned antiquarian indicated by the fragments, Cicero would not have made some reference to his work. Rawson argues that the silence of Varro and Cicero indicates a somewhat later date for Cincius, and also that he was probably in part dependent on Varro.[14] The many citations in Festus show that he must in any case be earlier than Verrius Flaccus.

[7] Walbank, *Comm.* 1. 29. Admittedly Polybius' account survives only in fragments and excerpts after 216 BC.

[8] More than thirty fragments are collected in Funaioli, *GRF* 371–82; also in E. Huschke (ed.), *Iurisprudentiae Anteiustinianae* (Leipzig, 1886), 84–92; E. P. Bremer, *Iurisprudentia Antehadriana* 1 (Leipzig, 1896), 252–60.

[9] Although Niebuhr (*Hist. Rom.* 1. 273) appears to have believed that Cincius the historian was responsible for all the fragments, and that he was an extremely conscientious investigator of ancient monuments and documents, Krause (68–72, 75–82) was already aware of the difficulties in this view, and preferred to attribute the antiquarian fragments to a later Cincius. He traced this idea back to J. H. M. Ernesti's edition of Longolius, *Notitia Hermundurorum* (Nuremberg, 1793).

[10] Hertz, *De Luciis Cinciis* (1842). On Mommsen's eccentric theory (*Chron.*[1], 315–19), that L. Cincius the antiquarian discovered the Greek annals of Cincius Alimentus, a distant ancestor, and published them with additions of his own, see comm. on F2. Mommsen's theory was taken further by T. Plüss, *De Cinciis rerum Romanarum scriptoribus* (Bonn, 1865), but has otherwise won no adherents (cf. Wissowa, *RE* 3. 2556).

[11] Hertz, *De Luciis Cinciis* (1842), 19; Mommsen, *Chron.*[1], 315; also Schanz–Hosius 1[4]. 174.

[12] G. Wissowa, *RE* 3. 2555; Funaioli, *GRF* 372; Heurgon, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 434 (arguing that Cincius must have seen the inscription recording the law of the *clauus annalis* (Livy 7.3.5–7; see below) before the Capitoline temple was destroyed by fire in 83 BC).

[13] Cic. *Att.* 1.1.1; 1.7; 1.8.2; 1.16.17; 1.20.1, 7; 4.4; 6.2.1. Mommsen believed (*Chron.*[1], 318) that the Cincius known to Cicero and Atticus was the father of the antiquarian.

[14] Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 247–8.

The difficulty we face is to decide whether any of the fragments attributed to Cincius or L. Cincius actually belong to the historian, and if so which ones. We have printed under the heading 'possible fragments' five passages that may have some sort of claim. They are also included as fragments of Cincius Alimentus by Chassignet and Beck–Walter (as well as Livy 7.3.7, which we have rejected: see below), but without any indication in the text that there might be doubt about the attribution;[15] Peter included two of them (as fr. 1–2 = F9–10) in his first edition, but in the second edition, influenced by the criticisms of Cichorius, he printed them in smaller type and within square brackets, indicating that he now believed them to belong rather to Cincius the antiquarian.

Two fragments (F6–7) are taken from the *OGR*, and, with every allowance for the general difficulties surrounding citations from that text, deserve to be considered, partly on the grounds that most (though not all) of its quotations are taken from historians. More to the point, Verbrugghe rightly notes that it cites almost all the republican historians who are known to have dealt with the origins of the city, and consequently that it would be surprising if Cincius Alimentus were not included among their number.[16] This is a powerful argument for identifying the Cincius who is twice quoted, and who is listed in the *titulus* (T5), as Cincius Alimentus the historian.

On the other hand it must be acknowledged that at least some of the authors cited in the *OGR* are antiquarians;[17] moreover there is a difficulty in the fact that F7, dealing with the Penates and the foundation of Alba Longa, is cited from book 2, while F6, dealing with the death of Tiberius Silvius, a later event, is from book 1 (the order is inverted, without comment, by Chassignet and Beck–Walter). The prima facie implication is that the work in question was not a chronological narrative, but perhaps rather an antiquarian work arranged systematically under headings. As things stand the issue remains unresolved, and the citations are included as 'possible fragments' (see further comm. on F6–7).

The remaining 'possible fragments' (F8–10) are included on the grounds that in each of them Cincius is cited alongside other historians: with Piso (9 F48) in F8, with Fabius (1 F27) and Gellius (14 F12b) in F9, and with Cassius (6 F2) in F10.[18] But this argument is far from conclusive, especially as antiquarians are also listed by Arnobius (F8 and comm.), and two of the fragments (F8, F10) deal with Latin etymologies.[19]

[15] Chassignet discusses the issue in her introduction (1. lxxv–lxxix), while Beck–Walter merely allude to it in a footnote (1. 138 n. 8).

[16] Verbrugghe, *Philologus* 126 (1982), 322. The *OGR* cites all the other republican historical sources that are known to have touched on the origins of the city, viz.: the *Annales Maximi*, Fabius Pictor (1), Postumius (4), Cato (5), Cassius (Hemina? (6)), Acilius (7), Piso (9), Sempronius (Tuditanus? (10)), Vennonius (13), Cn.(?) Gellius (14), Aufidius (17), Antias (25), Macer (27), Lutatius (32), Sallust, and Tubero (38): references in Richard, *OGR* 189. The only exception is Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8).

[17] On L. Caesar, the most frequently cited author of all, see I. Appendix 1, A24. The *titulus* mentions Varro and Verrius Flaccus, although they are not quoted in the text.

[18] Thus Verbrugghe, *Philologus* 126 (1982), 318–23, followed by Chassignet 1. lxxvi–lxxvii. Note, however, the problem of identifying the Fabius referred to in F9 (see comm. on Fabius 1 F27); and Verbrugghe certainly goes too far when he says (318) that 'references to other ancient historians cited by Victorinus and the Servian commentary *make it plain* the historian is meant' (our italics). Jacoby also printed F9–10 as fragments of Cincius Alimentus, without qualification (*FGrHist* 810 F6 7).

[19] This does not absolutely rule out a historian writing in Greek, but it does not encourage the inference. The same is true of Serv. *Aen.* 2.225 (*delubrum* derived *a diluendo*), which Verbrugghe (*Philologus* 126 (1982), 322–3) and Chassignet (1. 59) ascribe to Cincius Alimentus (Chassignet F13); but as there is no positive reason for doing so, we have excluded it.

Finally, we have printed as a 'doubtful fragment' (F 1 1) a passage of Fulgentius which purports to give a verbatim quotation from the history of Cincius Alimentus; but the improbable subject matter (Gorgias of Leontini!), and the fact that the quotation is in Latin, must mean that something is seriously wrong. Either the citation is bogus, as Jacoby thought (citing the fragment as 'zweifelhaftes-gefälschtes'), or Fulgentius or his source erroneously attributed to the historian a passage from L. Cincius' *De uerbis priscis* (see comm. ad loc.).

Some previous editors have attributed to Cincius Alimentus a famous passage in which Livy (7.3.5–7) digresses on the appointment of a *dictator claui figendi causa* ('dictator for fixing a nail') in 363 BC (Jacoby F8, Chassignet F9). The passage reads as follows: *lex uetusta est, priscis litteris uerbisque scripta, ut qui praetor maximus sit idibus Septembribus clauum pangat; fixa fuit dextro lateri aedis Iouis optimi maximi, ex qua parte Mineruae templum est. eum clauum, quia rarae per ea tempora litterae erant, notam numeri annorum fuisse ferunt eoque Mineruae templo dicatam legem quia numerus Mineruae inuentum sit.— Volsiniis quoque clauos indices numeri annorum fixos in templo Nortiae, Etruscae deae, comparere diligens talium monumentorum auctor Cincius adfirmat.* ('There is an ancient law, written in archaic words and letters, that he who is the chief magistrate on the Ides of September shall hammer in a nail. This notice was fixed on the right side of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, in the part where the chapel of Minerva is. This nail is said to have been a record of the number of years—written records being scarce in those days—and the reason why the law was placed in the chapel of Minerva was that numbers are an invention of hers. Cincius, a careful student of monuments of this kind, asserts that at Volsinii also nails were fixed in the temple of Nortia, an Etruscan goddess, to indicate the number of years.')

The only reason for identifying the Cincius named in this passage with Cincius Alimentus the historian is that Livy, unlike Dionysius, does not normally include antiquarian material, and never cites any grammarian or antiquarian elsewhere in the surviving portions of his work.[20] But although Livy does not normally include antiquarian digressions, there are one or two exceptional passages where he does precisely that, and this is one of them. There are in fact two digressions at the start of book 7 (on the origins of theatrical performances at Rome, and the current passage about nails), and both are certainly derived from antiquarian sources, the first probably from Varro, and this one from Cincius. As Peter rightly saw, the phrase *diligens talium monumentorum auctor* must point to the antiquarian L. Cincius rather than the historian.[21] Peter ascribed it to the *Mystagogica*, a work in at least two books (Fest. 498), which was probably a kind of guidebook (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 4.132); this suggestion was taken up by Jacques Heurgon in an important study that proved the point beyond all reasonable doubt.[22]

(EHB, TJC)

[20] Thus, Verbrugghe, *Philologus* 126 (1982), 320, following Hertz, *De Lucio Cincio* (1842), 19; Chassignet 1. lxxvii.

[21] Peter 1. cxii; cf. Cichorius, *RE* 3, 2557. The practice of hammering nails in order to mark the passage of time was also mentioned by Festus (*ap.* Paul. 49, s.v. *clauus annalis*), who was almost certainly dependent on Cincius, as Mommsen noted (*Chron.*[2], 177 n. 344; cf. Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 75).

[22] J. Heurgon, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 432–7; see also Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 247; Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 73–82.

3

P. Cornelius Scipio Africani f.

Principal discussions: Münzer, *RE* 4 (1901), 1437–8; Peter 1^2. cxviii–cxix; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 811; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 374–5; H. Beck, *BNJ* 811.

INTRODUCTION

Life

P. Cornelius Scipio was the elder son of Scipio Africanus, and a physical weakling (T1–2, Cic. *off.* 1.121). He adopted, after 180 BC (cf. Livy 45.40.7, Plut. *Paull.* 5.5) and before 168 (Liv.44.44.2), the second son of L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 182, 168), who became the great P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cos. 147, 134). He became an augur in 180 (Livy 40.42.13). It is unlikely that T4 is his epitaph; were that to be the case, it would follow that he was also *flamen Dialis*.

Work

Of Scipio's historical work we know only what Cicero says in T1, that it was written in Greek and that its style was very attractive. Peter reasonably took this to imply that it resembled that of Xenophon (cf. Catulus 19 T1); perhaps it was his adoptive father who was responsible for Aemilianus' affection for Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (Cic. *Q. fr.* 1.1.23, *Tusc.* 2.62).

(JB)

4

A. Postumius Albinus

Editions: Peter 1[2]. cxxiv–cxxvi, 53–4; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 812; Chassignet 1. lxxix–lxxxv, 59–61; Beck–Walter 1. 225–31; G. S. Bucher, *BNJ* 812.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 176–7; Münzer, 'A. Postumius (31) Albinus', *RE* 22.1 (1953), 902–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 71–3; Walbank, *Comm.* 3 (1975), 542–3, 726–8; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 372–4; J. Briscoe, 'A. Postumius Albinus, Polybius and Livy's account of the *Bacchanalia*', in *Hommages C. Deroux* 4 (Brussels 2003), 302–8.

INTRODUCTION

Life

We can confidently identify A. Postumius A. f. A. n. Albinus, consul in 151 BC, as the writer of a history of Rome in Greek (T3, 4, 7).[1] Of his early career we know only that he had been *praetor urbanus* in 155 (T2, 7); other details are less certain.[2] An A. Postumius Albinus was among the envoys who in 154 ended the war between Prusias and Attalus (Pol. 33.13.4); an A. Postumius appears under L. Aemilius Paullus in 167, receiving custody of Perseus and his family (Livy 45.28.11);[3] and in the previous year an A. Postumius Albinus was among the three legates who negotiated the surrender of Perseus on Samothrace (Livy 45.4.7); finally, an A. Postumius Albinus became *Xuir s.f.* in 173 (Livy 42.10.6).[4] Any or all of these may be our historian, the consul of 151.[5]

As consul he clashed with the tribunes, who attacked him and his colleague, L. Licinius Lucullus, for excessive harshness in conducting the levy for the war in

[1] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1. 52–3: *A. Postumius Albinus A. f. A. [n. Al]binus* (incorrectly transcribed in *MRR* 1. 455). Under the terms of the *lex Villia annalis* he cannot have been born later than 194. He was almost certainly the son of A. Postumius Albinus Luscus (cos.180, cens. 174) and the nephew of the consuls of 174 and 173 (see Peter cxxv n. 1; Münzer, *RE* 22. 903; Sumner, *Orators*, 42). See Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 374 for bibliography on the inconclusive attempt to identify a bust in the Louvre as Albinus.

[2] Münzer, *RE* 22. 903 suggested a curule aedileship in 159, the only possible year because the curule aediles of 165, 163, and 161 are known and do not include Postumius.

[3] Official capacity unknown; *MRR* suggests he was *tribunus militum* but without explicit evidence; see Briscoe in *Hommages C. Deroux* 4 (2003), 305 n. 29 for the treatment of Livy 45.4.7 and 45.28.11 in *MRR*.

[4] *MRR* 3. 173, following Sumner, *Orators*, 48. Broughton had originally thought this a reference to the father of the consul of 151; cf. n. 1.

[5] They are so regarded by Peter cxxv n. 1; Münzer, *RE* 22. 903; *MRR* (with the possibility that the envoy of 168 was instead the historian's father); and Walbank, *Comm.* 3. 726: the data fit a normal career structure for a consul of 151. *Contra* Gruen, *Hellenistic World*, 240, but with a doubtful interpretation of Pol. 39.1 (= T3a) §11.

Spain (Pol. 35.3.7–8; Livy *per.* 48; App. *Ib.* 49).[6] He may have received Italy as his province, as no overseas military activity is attested for him (his colleague received Hispania Citerior).[7] He was, however, present in Greece in 146 at the start of the war against the Achaean League (in which Polybius accuses him of cowardice—T3a), though his official capacity is unclear.[8] Postumius was a senior member of the ten-man commission that created the province of Achaea (T5),[9] and as a result statues in his honour were set up in Greece; inscriptions survive from Delphi and Olympia (T1a–b), and Atticus reported seeing a statue of him at the Isthmus (T6).

For our knowledge of Postumius as a man of letters we rely heavily on Cicero and Polybius. Polybius was a contemporary, but not a disinterested observer. As praetor in 155 Postumius presided when the senate rejected a request from the Achaean League for the release of its detainees, of whom Polybius was one. Rightly or wrongly, Polybius clearly held Postumius responsible, claiming that he had employed a procedural trick to engineer the result (T2).[10] This has given rise to the suspicion that his disparaging references to Postumius elsewhere in his work were motivated by spite.[11] In a brief excursus in book 39 (T3a) he attacks Postumius as a coward who attempted to claim the credit for others' achievements; he suggests moreover that his enthusiasm for Greek culture brought Hellenism into disrepute among the Romans, but that his own command of Greek was limited, so that he had to make absurd excuses in the preface to his history. It is clear that allowance must be made for this hostility, which may have had a literary as well as political basis, but it would be unwise to dismiss Polybius' testimony altogether. There is independent evidence that Cato and other Romans shared Polybius' view of Postumius' brand of Hellenism.[12] As for the charge of cowardice, we cannot be sure that Postumius' illness was not genuine or that his report was intended to deceive the senate about his role in the events (it was quite proper for the senior senator, as Postumius was, to send reports back to Rome).[13]

Cicero presents an altogether more positive picture of Postumius. He includes him first among the group of orators who reached prominence in the later years of Cato

[6] Livy *per.* 48 reports that the consuls were imprisoned, but see Cic. *leg.* 3.20, with J. S. Richardson, *Hispaniae* (Cambridge, 1986), 30 n. 17.

[7] *Contra* Walbank, *JRS* 52 (1962), 5 (perhaps misled by Pol. 35.3.7–8). In 151–150 Hispania Citerior was held by Postumius' colleague, L. Licinius Lucullus, and Hispania Ulterior by the praetor Ser. Sulpicius Galba (references in *MRR*).

[8] Perhaps he was legate of Mummius, sent ahead to liaise with Metellus.

[9] Münzer, *RE* 22. 906, argued that he led the commission, given that he is remembered by Cicero (T5) and was senior to its other known members. Walbank (*Comm.* 3. 726), however, prefers L. Aurelius Orestes as leader.

[10] As to the facts, Münzer (*RE* 22. 904) rejects Polybius' complaint, but Walbank (*Comm.* 3. 543, following Lehmann) is prepared to admit the possibility of hostility on the part of Postumius.

[11] Thus Münzer, *RE* 22. 902–6; Walbank, *Comm.* 3. 542–3, 726–8; *JRS* 52 (1962), 5. Münzer even suggested that Polybius deliberately omitted to mention Postumius' role as member of the commission of 146; but Cicero makes it clear (T5) that Polybius did not name any of the ten commissioners. Note also that Polybius does not criticize Postumius' role in the recruitment crisis of 151.

[12] See T3a–d. As Walbank (*Comm.* 3. 727) points out, a charge of Hellenophilia was later made by Q. Mucius Scaevola (cos. 117) against T. Albucius (Cic. *fin.* 1.9; the whole of *fin.* 1.7–10 is relevant). Of course, as a writer of history in Latin, Cato had his own reasons for attacking Postumius' enterprise. Münzer *et al.* emphasize that it was Cato and not Postumius who was departing from tradition.

[13] Thus Münzer, *RE* 22. 905 (followed by Walbank, *Comm.* 3. 728), who also questions whether Postumius was supposed to take part in fighting. Indeed, if he was a legate sent ahead of Mummius (n. 8.), there was good reason for him not to.

(T4), and he read his history with some approval (T7). He considered him *litteratus* (T4), *disertus* (T4), *sane doctus* (T7), and *persona idonea* as a character in a proposed dialogue to be presented in the form of a political debate at Olympia (T6). The exchange between Postumius and Carneades (T7) shows Postumius' interest in Greek philosophy, and Carneades' quick wit.[14]

Works: (a) History in Greek

The testimonia speak of a history written in Greek. Polybius mentions also a poem, by which he probably means an epic. Nothing certain is known about this poem, and very little about the history. At least the first book of the history had appeared before the death of Cato in 149 (T3a–d), which means that Postumius was writing before the end of his public career.[15] Neither of the two certain fragments concerns events later than the end of the regal period: F1 is from the preface, and F2 concerns L. Junius Brutus (cos. 509).[16] On the other hand Polybius describes Postumius' history as πραγματική (T3a §4), a term which probably means that it was concerned with political and military affairs rather than legendary events.[17] This lends support to the view, adopted here, that F3–4, dealing with the mythical origins of Rome, come from a separate work *De aduentu Aeneae* (see below). As to the intended readership, the preface (F1) must mean that the work was addressed at least in part to Greeks (see comm. on F1). To what extent this influenced the content and presentation of Postumius' work, and distinguished it from those of other Roman historians, cannot be gauged.

Given that the testimonia unanimously refer to a history in Greek, it is odd that one fragment seems to be from a work in Latin (F2: the Latin of F1 is derived explicitly from a Greek original; see further below). The various explanations that have been offered can be divided broadly into two main possibilities: (i) the Latin history was a separate work, either by the same author or by another Postumius;[18] (ii) the Latin

[14] We follow D. Obbink and P. A. Vander Waerdt, *GRBS* 32 (1991), 390–5 in retaining *quia sapiens non sum* (*contra* J. S. Reid in his edition (London, 1885), 338–9, where it is considered an interpolation). In teasing Carneades, Postumius mistakenly attributes Stoic doctrine to him. Postumius may have been misled by Carneades' practice of summarizing opponents' positions and using their own premises against them.

[15] Peter cxxv (followed e.g. by P. Pédech, *La Méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris, 1964), 375 n. 135), thought the whole work to have been completed by 149. This is possible, but strictly we know only that the first book appeared before the death of Cato (cf. Chassignet lxxxiii; Münzer, *RE* 22. 907). Gellius' *his libris* (F1b; *illis libris* in Macrobius) indicates a work of more than one book, but prefaces could include unfulfilled intentions. These uncertainties, and the paucity of fragments, make it impossible to be sure, although it remains likely, that Postumius' work appeared before Cato's *Origines*.

[16] There is no reason to suppose that the work was incomplete (as Münzer thought: *RE* 22. 907).

[17] Polybius' thoughts on this matter are outlined in 9.1–2. 'Pragmatic' history is concerned with the actions of nations, cities, and kings (*περὶ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων καί δυναστῶν*: 9.1.4); at 9.2.4 he implies that *ὁ πραγματικὸς τρόπος* is principally focused on contemporary history, but the political and military history of earlier periods is certainly not excluded. The contrast is rather with 'genealogies, myths, colonies, ties of kinship, and foundations' (9.2.1: *τά τε περὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθους καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας, ἔτι δὲ συγγενείας καὶ κτίσεις*. cf. 9.1.4). See Walbank ad loc.; *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge, 2002), 6–8; Pédech, *Méthode historique* (see n. 15), 21–32; in relation to Postumius, Walbank on Pol. 39.1; W. Kierdorf, *DNP* 10 (2001), 222–3.

[18] Separate work by the same author: Vossius, *Hist. Lat.*[2], 24; by a different Postumius: Krause, 129–30—he suggested that by referring to a Greek history Cicero, Gellius, Macrobius, and Plutarch were distinguishing his work from that in Latin by another Postumius. Peter (cxxv) rightly rejected this argument: the language of the work is referred to in order to emphasize Postumius' erudition, and his consular colleague is mentioned in order to distinguish the author from the many other Auli Postumii.

work was a translation of the Greek work, either by the author himself[19] or by someone else.[20] The idea of a separate work in Latin cannot be excluded, especially in view of the evidence for a work *De aduentu Aeneae* by an A. Postumius (see below). But as an account of the arrival of Aeneas is unlikely to have dealt with Brutus, we should have to imagine a further, otherwise unknown work. Another author named Postumius is theoretically conceivable. An Albinus wrote *Res Romanae* in verse (we have one fragment from its first book), and an Albinus wrote a treatise on metre (we again have one fragment).[21] The *Res Romanae* was a poem written no earlier than the mid-first century BC, since the surviving fragment concerns Pompey's three triumphs; but it cannot be the source of our prose fragment, and it is not certain in any case that this Albinus was a Postumius. Nevertheless the more economical solution remains that the Greek original was translated into Latin by the author or an unknown translator.

One might ask, however, whether such explanations are necessary. A more radical approach seeks to cut the Gordian knot by denying altogether the existence of a work in Latin. On this view F2 was the result of an ad hoc translation of a passage extracted from the Greek text, rather than an extract from a Latin translation of the whole work. Latin authors were certainly in the habit of doing this. Frier points out that Cornelius Nepos twice quotes Thucydides directly, but in what was presumably his own Latin translation;[22] this may also be the explanation for Postumius F1b, where Gellius (followed by Macrobius) summarizes the preface of the work, and quotes the key sentence in direct speech. In this instance Gellius acknowledges that he is taking the passage at second hand from Cornelius Nepos, and Macrobius almost certainly follows Gellius;[23] but both knew that the original text was in Greek, first because they say so explicitly, and second because of the obvious sense of the passage. But in the case of F2 Macrobius quotes the passage to exemplify the use of the Latin word *grossus* (actually in the diminutive form *grossulus*) to mean an unripe fig. This must mean that he did not himself translate the Greek text,[24] but found it already translated in his source; not realizing, or forgetting, that Postumius had written in Greek, Macrobius took it as an authentic piece of early Latin.[25] If this is right, and we are inclined to think it is, the evidence for a Latin work disappears.

The certain fragments give us very little information on the scope and content of the work. F1b confirms the content of the preface as reported by Polybius; and F2, if it reflects the Greek history, shows that the work went back at least to the late regal period. The complete absence of information about the rest of Postumius' history has

[19] Suggested as a possibility by Badian, 'Early historians', 7.

[20] This is the most common conclusion: Rösenberg, *Einleitung*, 126; Schanz, *GRL*, 100; Schanz–Hosius I⁴. 177; Münzer, *RE* 22. 908. Peter (CXXV) suggested that a later Postumius translated the work into Latin and continued it down to his own time.

[21] *Res Romanae*: Priscian *GL* 2.304=Courtney, *FLP* 425 F1: *ille cui ternis Capitolia celsa triumphis | sponte deum patuere, cui freta nulla repostos | abscondere sinus, non tutae moenibus urbes.* The work *de metris*: Victorinus *GL* 6.211–12=Courtney, *FLP* 425 F2; and Rufinus *GL* 6.565.

[22] Nepos, *Them.* 9.2–4 (=Thuc. 1.137.4); *Paus.* 2.3–4 (=Thuc. 1.128.7); Frier, *Libri Annales*, 248–9.

[23] N. Marinone, *StudUrb (B)* 49 (1975), 497–8.

[24] As Bardon wrongly thought (*Litt. inconnue*, 1. 72): so too Chassignet lxxviii, and *TLL* 6.2.2336.36–7: '*uerba sunt e graeco uersa a Macr.*'.

[25] Thus Frier, *Libri Annales*, 249.

not prevented speculation.[26] Beloch suggested that Postumius' work, on the assumption that it was more expansive than that of previous Roman historians, was a major source for Polybius, whose mixing of Roman and Carthaginian sources may already in part have been done for him by Postumius;[27] and if Bickerman was right that the correspondence between Pyrrhus and P. Valerius Laevinus (DH 19.9–10) goes back to a Roman source written in Greek between *c.*170 and *c.*120 BC, Postumius is a candidate (along with Acilius, whom Bickerman actually preferred).[28] Mazzarino saw Postumius as the source for Livy 42.19.1–2, which reports L. Postumius Albinus' recovery of illegally held parts of the Ager Campanus.[29] More recently it has been suggested that Dionysius' account of the battle of Lake Regillus goes back ultimately to Postumius, in particular that he was the first to present this engagement in Homeric form, and the first to make the dictator vow a temple to Ceres, Liber, and Libera. These speculations are based on the likelihood that Postumius the historian would have been particularly keen to write up the exploits of his own family.[30] A similar reasoning has been used to suggest that Livy's account of the Bacchanalian episode (39.8–14) is derived from Postumius, whose source was a *fabula praetexta* on the exploits of his relative (Sp. Postumius Albinus, cos. 186).[31]

These suggestions should be treated with caution. It is true that Polybius' criticism of Postumius does not prove that he did not use his work, but there are no grounds for following Beloch in drawing conclusions about its character or its role as a source for Polybius. Nor should we assume that Postumius was responsible for the versions of events involving other Postumii which appear in later writers. In the case of the battle of Regillus, while Postumius would indeed have had a motive to draw attention to the dictator's role, it does not follow that he did, or that he was the first to do so. The same can be said for the Bacchanalian episode. Before assigning its invention to a particular historian, we should remember that Livy's account is not necessarily in origin a historiographical fabrication, but perhaps a fabrication by the consul himself which was subsequently taken up by historians.[32]

[26] The characterization of Postumius and Acilius in B. Riposati, *Storia della Letteratura Latina* (10th edn., Milan, 1974), 156, is based on no hard evidence: 'C'è in loro una certa tendenza a distaccarsi dal metodo puramente annalistico e ad elaborare gli avvenimenti con una certa libertà personale . . . '

[27] K. J. Beloch, *Hermes* 50 (1915), 357–72, esp. 368–71.

[28] E. J. Bickerman, *CPh* 42 (1947), 137–46. See also introduction to Acilius.

[29] Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.2, 321–2, arguing that the report of similar activities by P. Cornelius Lentulus as urban praetor in 165 (Gran. Lic. 28.29–40) suggests the work of a later anti-Gracchan source keen to attribute such measures to a prominent anti-Gracchan.

[30] As a kinsman two generations later was to do on coins: Crawford, *RRC* 335.10b. For the possible role of the historian Postumius see Wiseman, *Roman Drama*, 35–6, 86–7.

[31] Wiseman, *Roman Drama*, 47–8. J.-M. Pailler, *Bacchanalia: la répression de 186 av. J.-C. à Rome et en Italie* (Rome, 1988), esp. 600–12, thinks Albinus to be Livy's source via Polybius. But it seems unlikely that such an important episode would have been ignored by the excerptor of book 22 had Polybius given it anything like the prominence it had in Livy. Indications that Livy's source was written in Latin (e.g. stylistic imitation of the *s.c. de Bacchanalibus* (perfect infinitives with prohibitions dependent on *nolo* at 39.14.8 and 17.3)) do not exclude the possibility that Postumius was the ultimate (but indirect) source for other elements of Livy's account. On all this see now Briscoe, *Hommages C. Deroux* (2003), 302–8.

[32] *Contra* Wiseman (n. 30), 47. Sp. Postumius' fabrication may have appeared for the first time in Postumius, but this would not make him responsible for its content; it might make him the beneficiary of a chronological accident—perhaps he was the next to publish after 186.

Works: (b) De aduentu Aeneae

Polybius' description (T3a) of Postumius' history as πραγματική ἱστορία probably indicates that it was concerned with political and military affairs rather than legends (see above, and n. 17). But two preserved fragments do in fact deal with legendary events, in particular the wandering of Aeneas (F3) and Ascanius' exploits in Latium (F4). Both fragments are attributed to a work entitled *De aduentu Aeneae*. This can hardly be a reference to the history as a whole, or even to the first book, which went down at least to the end of the monarchy (F2).[33] It is equally unlikely to be a descriptive reference to a portion of the narrative, partly because 'the arrival of Aeneas' is hardly suitable as a description of a passage dealing with events after the death of Aeneas (F4), but principally because the same phrase is used in both fragments, by authors who are almost certainly independent of each other (see further comm. on F4), and in both cases apparently as the title of a separate work.[34]

While we can be reasonably confident that F3–4 come from a separate work *De aduentu Aeneae* by an A. Postumius, we cannot be sure that he was the same Postumius who wrote a history in Greek. Some who think he was have identified the *De aduentu Aeneae* as the poem which Polybius (T3a §4) says Postumius wrote in addition to the history.[35] Bardon speculates on its character: 'quelque poème savant, bourré de science, sinon de poésie . . . à la manière des Alexandrins'. That Postumius explained the more recent change from Boiae to Baiae would not be inconsistent with a work influenced by Alexandrian scholarly epic. One obstacle to this theory, however, is that F4 has *conscripsit atque* <. . .> *dedit*; and *conscribere* normally refers to the writing of prose works.[36] Although the question of authorship must remain open, we have included the fragments of the *De aduentu Aeneae* with those of A. Postumius Albinus for the sake of convenience, and in the absence of any firm evidence to the contrary.

(SJN)

[33] P. L. Schmidt (*RE* Suppl. 15, 1607) tried to rescue the idea that *De aduentu Aeneae* was a subtitle for book 1 by conjecturing that *Annali II* should be read in F2. The parallel case of Fest. 326, *Cephalon Gergithius qui de aduentu Aeneae in Italiam uidetur conscripsisse* (=Hegesianax, *FGrHist* 45 F10), is not especially helpful. The phrase *de aduentu Aeneae* is here probably a general description of all or part of the work (*Troika*) of Cephalon (a pseudepigraph of Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas).

[34] This is certain in the case of F4. In F3 it is suggested initially by the parallel with *Lutatius communium historiarum*, clearly itself a title. If '*de aduentu Aeneae*' were simply introducing subject matter ('concerning the arrival of Aeneas . . .'), we should expect *de aduentu Aeneae Postumius et Lutatius communium historiarum . . . dicunt*. Servius Danielis consistently gives more book numbers and titles of works cited than does Servius (see R. B. Lloyd, *HSCPh* 65 (1961), 291–341). This adds circumstantially to the view that Servius (DS) 9.710 reports the title of a separate work by Postumius. This conclusion was accepted by Popma and other early editors, by Schanz–Hosius 1[4]. 177, and by modern editors of *OGR*, including Puccioni, Richard, and D'Anna. Peter, on the other hand, rejected F4 (as from the *OGR*) and regarded F3 as part of the history, even venturing to emend the text (cxxv–cxxvi), although he printed the fragment as if it were from a separate work, and with the text unchanged. Jacoby, Chassignet, and Beck–Walter also include F3–4 among the fragments of the history. Along the same lines: Schanz, *GRL* 1. 100; Münzer, *RE* 22. 908; J. Perret, *Les Origines*, 556 n. 2; Schmidt (see n. 33).

[35] Schanz–Hosius 1[4]. 177; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 73; G. Forsythe in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic* (Rome, 2000), 3: 'this poem can actually be identified as an epyllion concerning Aeneas' arrival in Italy.'

[36] See *TLL* 4.373–7. *conscribere* is used almost exclusively with prose (e.g. *historiae*, *res gestae*, *orationes*, *epistulae*), otherwise only once with *carmina* and once with *tragoediae* (*uersus* at Martial 6.14.4 is based on a dubious emendation). It is used regularly with *liber* as in F4, presumably with the same implication of a work in prose.

5

M. Porcius Cato

Editions: A. Wagener, *M. Porcii Catonis Originum fragmenta* (Bonn, 1849); A. Bormann, *M. Porcii Catonis Originum libri septem* (Diss. Brandenburg, 1858); H. Jordan, *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant* (Leipzig, 1860); Peter 1^2. cxxvii–clxiv, 55–97; W. A. Schröder, *M. Porcius Cato. Das erste Buch der Origines* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971); M. Chassignet, *Caton. les Origines* (Paris, 1986); Horsfall, *Nepos* (1989), 36–8 (a selection of fragments of Cato's *Origines* in translation, with notes); Beck–Walter 1. 148–224; P. Cugusi, M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi, *Opere di Marco Porcio Catone* 1–2 (Turin, 2001).[1]

Principal discussions: A. von Gutschmid, 'Catos Origines' (1866), *Kl. Schr.* 5 (1894), 518–26; Leo, *GRL* 1 (1913), 290–300; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 163–6; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 186–90; F. Klingner, 'Cato Censorius und die Krisis Roms', *Die Antike* 10 (1934), 239–63 (=*Röm.Geisteswelt*^{3} (1961), 34–65); E. V. Marmorale, *Cato Maior* (2nd edn., Bari, 1949), 224–36; L. Moretti, 'Le "origines" di Catone, Timeo ed Eratostene', *RFIC* 80 (1952), 289–302; De Sanctis, *SR* 4.2.1 (1953), 60–5; R. Helm, 'M. Porcius (9) Cato', *RE* 22 (1953), 145–65, esp. 156–62; F. Bömer, 'Thematik und Krise der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Historia* 2 (1953–4), 189–209, esp 193–8; D. Kienast, *Cato der Zensor: seine Persönlichkeit und seine Zeit* (Heidelberg, 1954; 2nd edn., 1979), 107–16; K. Meister, 'Zu römischen Historikern. 1. Der Titel von Catos Geschichtswerk', *AAWW* 101 (1964), 1–8; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 7–11; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2 (1966), 87–94, 99, 105–6, 438; F. Della Corte, *Catone Censore: la vita e la fortuna* (2nd edn., Florence, 1969), 77–89, 94–6; H. Traenkle, 'Catos Origines im Geschichtswerk des Livius', *Festschr. K. Büchner* (Wiesbaden, 1970), 274–85; D. Timpe, 'Le "origini" di Catone e la storiografia latina', *AAP* 83 (1970–1), 5–33; T. J. Cornell, 'Cato's *Origines* and the non-Roman historical tradition about ancient Italy', unpublished dissertation, London (1972); Astin, *Cato* (1978), 211–39; W. Kierdorf, 'Catos Origines und die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Chiron* 10 (1980), 205–24; C. Letta, 'L'Italia dei mores Romani nelle *Origines* di Catone', *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 3–30, 416–39; M. Chassignet, 'Caton et l'impérialisme romain au IIe siècle av. J-C d'après les *Origines*', *Latomus* 46 (1987), 285–300; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity* (1992), 52–83, esp. 59–61, 82–3; E. Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men* (Oxford, 1995), 17–19; M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi, P. Cugusi, 'Problematica catoniana', *BSL* 26 (1996), 82–218 (annotated bibliography 1978–93); T. Hantos, 'Cato Censorius. Die Grundgedanken seiner Politik', in *Festschr. K. Christ* (Stuttgart, 1998), 317–33; Flach, *RGS*^{3} (1998), 68–74; J. H. C. Williams, *Beyond the Rubicon* (Oxford, 2001), esp. 35–79; M. Sbardella, 'De compositione Originum Catonis', *Latinitas* 49 (2001), 172–4; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 380–418, esp. 387–94; M. Sbardella, 'Le "Origines" catoniane: ipotesi di datazione, intitolazione, struttura', *StudRom* 51 (2003), 3–14; U. Gotter, 'Die Vergangenheit als Kampfplatz der Gegenwart: Catos (konter)revolutionäre Konstruktion des republikanischen Erinnerungsraums', in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG*

[1] The recent edition by the husband-and-wife team P. Cugusi and M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi is referred to in what follows simply as 'Cugusi', not only for convenience and ease of reference, but because they divided the task between them (as explained at 1. 174–5). The fragments of the *Origines*, minor works, and *fragmenta incerta* were edited by Paolo Cugusi, while his wife, Maria Teresa Sblendorio Cugusi, edited the *De agri cultura* and the fragments of the *Orationes*.

(Darmstadt, 2003), 115–34; W. Suerbaum, *Cato Censorius in der Forschung des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Hildesheim, 2004); U. Walter, *Memoria und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur der römischen Republik* (Frankfurt a.M., 2004), 279–96; E. Sciarrino, 'Putting Cato's "Origines" in its place', *CA* 23 (2004), 323–57; C. Montelcone, 'Indizi di un programma storiografico', *QS* 64 (2006), 271–302; C. Letta, 'I legami tra i popoli italici nelle "Origines" di Catone tra consapevolezza etnica e ideologia', in G. Urso (ed.), *Patria diuersis gentibus una? Unità politica e identità etniche nell'Italia antica* (Pisa, 2008), 171–95; T. J. Cornell, 'Cato the Elder and the origins of Roman autobiography', in C. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (Swansea, 2009), 15–40; U. Gotter, 'Cato's *Origines*: the historian and his enemies', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge, 2009), 108–22; T. J. Cornell, 'Universal history and the early Roman historians', in P. Liddel, A. Fear (eds.), *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal Historiography* (London, 2010), 102–15, esp. 107–12; J. Briscoe, 'The fragments of Cato's *Origines*', in E. Dickey, A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, 2010), 154–60.

INTRODUCTION

Life[2]

M. Porcius Cato was born in Tusculum in 234 BC of a well-to-do equestrian family, and was brought up on a family estate in the Sabine hills. A *nouus homo*, he rose to prominence thanks to the patronage of L. Valerius Flaccus, a patrician neighbour who recognised his early promise, and who in his own political career adopted Cato as his plebeian running-mate.

Cato served with distinction in the Second Punic War, starting in 216 BC. From 214 to 210 he was military tribune in Sicily under Marcellus, and in 207 he fought at the Metaurus. In 204 he held the quaestorship and served under Scipio in Sicily and Africa, returning in 203 or 202 via Sardinia, whence he is said to have brought the poet Ennius to Rome. He then passed rapidly through the *cursus honorum*, holding the plebeian aedileship in 199 and the praetorship in 198, in which he governed Sardinia and gained a reputation for honesty and frugality. He was consul in 195 and censor in 184 (after an unsuccessful candidacy in 189), both times with Valerius Flaccus as his colleague; probably before his consulship Cato had begun to outshine his patrician partner. As consul in 195 and proconsul in 194 he fought a successful campaign in Hither Spain and won a decisive battle at Emporiae, for which he was awarded a triumph (see F133 and comm.). In 191 he served in Greece as military tribune

[2] Only a brief summary can be given here of the life and career of Cato. For further reading, apart from the biographical works cited in the bibliography (Marmorale, *Cato Maior* (1949); Kienast, *Cato der Zensor* (1954); Della Corte, *Catone Censore* (1969); and above all Astin, *Cato*), see particularly the studies of P. Fraccaro, collected in his *Opuscula* 1 (Pavia 1956): 'Sulla biografia di Catone Maggiore sino al consolato' (1910), 139–76; 'Le fonti per il consolato di M. Porcio Catone' (1910), 177–226; 'Catoniana' (1910), 227–56; 'Ricerche storiche e letterarie sulla censura di 184–183' (1911), 417–508; 'Catone Censore in Tito Livio' (1934), 115–37, etc. See also his article 'Catone' in *Enciclopedia Italiana* 9 (1931), 456–60. Also important: De Sanctis, *SR* 4.1 (1923), 579–82, 586–7, 600–4, 614–16; 4.3 (1964), 17–18; Scullard, *Roman Politics*[2], 110–4, 153–65, 220–6, 287–8, 291–3, and *passim*; M. Gelzer, *RE* 22 (1953), s.v. 'Porcius' (9), 108–45. W. Suerbaum, *Cato Censorius* (2004), provides a complete bibliography on all aspects of Cato's life and works down to the year 2000.

(or legate), and fought against the forces of Antiochus III and the Aetolians at Thermopylae (cf. F136 and comm.).

In his political career Cato adopted a conservative stance and openly expressed his opposition to the rapid cultural changes that were affecting Roman society in an age of imperial expansion. His unceasing campaign against the growth of luxury and decadence expressed itself in an austere personal lifestyle and enthusiasm for sumptuary legislation (notably his defence of the *lex Oppia* in 195 and support for the *lex Orchia* in 182). As censor in 184 he imposed high tariffs on luxury items and was scrupulous in letting contracts for (extensive) public works on terms most favourable to the treasury.

His political activities, which continued to the end of his long life, entailed numerous court cases in which he was engaged as prosecutor, prosecution witness, and defendant. The indictment of political opponents on criminal charges was a standard weapon in political struggles, and Cato was regularly in the thick of them. Nevertheless he managed to present his forensic campaigns as contributions to a moral crusade against corruption and dishonesty in public life; the underlying political motives (if any) were concealed in a career devoted to uncovering political scandals and chastising those who fell short of his own austere standards. During the 180s he is said to have instigated the trials of the Scipios. Other notable targets included Q. Minucius Thermus, M'. Acilius Glabrio, L. Quinctius Flamininus, M. Fulvius Nobilior, and Ser. Sulpicius Galba, whose case in 149 BC was the occasion for Cato's last appearance on the public stage, at the age of 85 (see T13).

In the last years of his life Cato became obsessed with what he perceived as the threat of Carthage, where he had been sent on an embassy in 153; from then on he ended every speech in the senate by stating his opinion that Carthage must be destroyed. When war was eventually declared in 149, it was largely at his insistence. He died in 149 or early in 148.

Works[3]

Cato was one of the great intellectual figures of his generation, and the father of Latin prose literature. His published works included speeches, of which we possess fragments of around eighty, and of which more than 150 were known to Cicero (T16a), works on farming (the *De agri cultura*, which has survived), military science (*De re militari*), and law (a poorly attested work of unknown scope). Gellius (11.2.1) quotes from a work, probably in prose, entitled *Carmen de moribus*, which is normally interpreted as a didactic work on personal conduct, but which from the title and the passages quoted by Gellius could equally be a work of antiquarian character on the customs (*mores*) of the ancient Romans. The indications are that all these literary productions were the work of Cato's old age.

[3] Discussion of Cato's literary output can be found in biographies of Cato (see previous note), best of all in Astin, *Cato*, 182–210. Cato's writings are also discussed in histories of Latin literature and other works cited in the bibliography, including those of Leo (1913), Schanz–Hosius (1927), Klingner (1934), De Sanctis (1953), Helm (1953), and Gruen (1992), but most recently Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt I. 380–418, with full bibliography. M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi and P. Cugusi offer a detailed critical survey of scholarship on Cato's works (from 1978 to 1993) in *BSL* 26 (1996), 82–218.

Cato also assembled a collection of his sayings (*dicta*) which was known to Cicero, and in the 180s and 170s wrote a work addressed to his elder son who was born around 192 BC.[4] It included letters and a series of admonitions on a variety of topics such as medicine, rhetoric, agriculture, and perhaps history (T6b, and see further below). All of these works circulated in the public domain, and were known to later writers; that is the most one can say in answer to the question whether Cato intended them 'for publication'. Cato's most important and ambitious literary project, however, was his historical work, the *Origines*, which will be discussed presently.

It is disputed how far Cato's literary activity was the product of sustained reading and intellectual enquiry. The evidence certainly suggests that he had a native talent for self-expression and was a 'natural orator'.[5] Texts such as T3a, T5a–b, T14a, and T17 imply that he lacked 'refinement' of the kind that could be acquired by the study of rhetorical theory and philosophy. That may also be what Nepos means when he says (T1) that the *Origines* lacked *doctrina*.[6]

On the other hand, Cato probably learned Greek during his youth; the story that he was taught by Ennius (*de vir. ill.* 47.1) may be apocryphal, but there is reason to believe that he knew the language at an early stage in his career, and certainly by 191 BC.[7] Texts stating that he studied Greek literature in old age (e.g. T4, T6a) do not imply that he came to the language only late in life; and in any case there is clear evidence from Cato's own sayings and writings that he was quite well read (as we shall see, I. 209), and had an easy familiarity with Homer, Xenophon, Demosthenes, and other Greek writers.[8] There is something to be said for the idea that Cato practised the precept he set out in one of the works addressed to his son: that one should look into their (sc. the Greeks') literature, but not study it thoroughly (*illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere*: Plin. *nat.* 29.14=*ad Marcum filium* fr. 1 Cugusi).

This raises the whole question of Cato's attitude to the Greeks and their culture, which he is said to have disparaged whenever he had the chance.[9] In view of his knowledge of Greek language and literature this notorious hostility is paradoxical, and

[4] Fragments in Jordan 77–80; Cugusi 2. 422–39. The so-called *libri ad filium* were once thought to be a systematic compendium or 'encyclopedia', but this overblown interpretation was decisively rejected by Astin, *Cato*, 332–40 (with full references to earlier bibliography). Further discussion of the work's purpose in Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 76–80.

[5] On the concept of a 'natural orator' see Astin, *Cato*, 150. Astin had witnessed natural oratory at first hand in the political arena of Northern Ireland in the 1970s.

[6] Taking *in quibus* to refer to the work as a whole, rather than to Cato's account of *admiranda* in Italy and Spain. Thus e.g. Della Corte, *Catone Censore* (1969), 197–8; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 59, 67. Astin, *Cato*, 223, suggests that *nulla doctrina* signifies 'a lack of learned discussion or a failure to name other literary authorities', which is probably true of the *Origines*. But it may also refer to Cato's lack of rhetorical training and the fact that he was essentially self-taught. But see further I. 217 and nn. 79–80.

[7] Plut. *Cato Maior* 12.4; Astin, *Cato*, 160.

[8] Astin, *Cato*, 160–9; Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 8–14; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 57–8. For Greek influences in surviving works and fragments of Cato see further R. Till, *Die Sprache Catos* (Leipzig, 1935), translated and revised as *La lingua di Catone* (Florence, 1968); E. Fraenkel, *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* (Rome, 1968), 22–3; S. Boscherini, *Lingua e scienza greca nel 'De agri cultura' di Catone* (Rome, 1970). F76 may reveal direct acquaintance with Herodotus. See comm. ad loc.

[9] Cato and the Greeks. Among the works cited in the bibliography, notice especially Kienast, *Cato der Zensor* (1954), 101–16; Astin, *Cato*, 157–81; Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 5–25; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 52–83. See further A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy* (London, 1965), 2. 426–30, 500–17; N. Petrochilos, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks* (Athens, 1974), 166–9; J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme* (Paris, 1988), 537–9.

cannot be put down to crude xenophobia or a wholesale rejection of everything Greek. The matter is evidently more complex. It is noteworthy that most of his pronouncements on this subject are concerned with the impact of Greek culture on Roman life, and the ways in which his fellow citizens were responding to it. It was at the interface between Hellenism and the native Roman tradition that problems arose. Cato was not alone in thinking that a balance must be struck, and that while some aspects of Hellenism were beneficial others were not. Other Roman aristocrats, including men of culture such as Scipio Aemilianus, also had mixed feelings about the Greeks (so too, for that matter, did Cicero). Most interesting is the case of Polybius, who makes many derogatory remarks about his Greek contemporaries (and many complimentary ones about the Romans). In one famous passage he declares that the corruption of Roman youth in his time was the result of Greek moral laxity which had affected the Romans after the Third Macedonian War. To illustrate the damaging effects of this process he quotes Cato with approval, and points to the young Scipio as an example of moderation in contrast to the growing extravagance (31.25.4–9; cf. 6.56.13–15; 18.34.7).

Cato may have believed that some aspects of Greek culture could bring benefits to Rome, but that they should not be overvalued. He also undoubtedly considered that others were subversive and potentially harmful (e.g. philosophy and medicine: Plut. *Cat. mai.* 23.1–3; Plin. *nat.* 29.14). Moreover, acknowledging the value of some aspects of Hellenism most assuredly did not entail the rejection of native Roman customs and traditions. He clearly objected strongly to the idea that Greek culture should in any way inform Roman practice. On the contrary, 'the Censor took as his task not the repression of Hellenism but the assertion of its inferiority to national values'.[10] But what Cato disliked most of all was the pretentious and indiscriminate cult of Hellenism that was fashionable in some circles at Rome, especially when the Hellenizers tried to turn their backs on, and even to apologize for, their own language and culture. This attitude is clear from his devastating attack on A. Postumius Albinus, who had begun his history by asking his readers to forgive any errors he might make in his Greek (Polyb. 39.12, and see Postumius 4 T3, F1). What made Cato furious was not so much that Albinus was apologizing for his poor Greek, but that he was apologizing for being Roman. Finally, Cato evidently believed (and he shared this belief with Polybius, among others) that the Greeks of his own time were very different from the great men of the classical past (Plut. *Cat. mai.* 8.14). Cato's views on this matter were evidently complex; but an understanding of them is essential for any serious interpretation of the fragments of the *Origines*, the historical work to which we may now turn.

The Origines

One thing that is certain about the *Origines* is that it was written in Latin; indeed, it is conventionally assumed that Cato was the first to write history in Latin prose. The assumption is based on the fact that no earlier Latin histories are known (even if part of Cassius Hemina's work was written before 149 BC, he did not complete it until

[10] Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 74.

years later, and Cato's priority seems assured: see introduction to Hemina (6)). Nevertheless it is surprising that none of our relatively numerous sources makes any reference to Cato's supposed achievement as the first Latin historian, especially in view of his immense reputation and of the Romans' fondness for recording 'firsts' in every field, including literature. The answer may be that the first place was generally conceded to Fabius Pictor, whose work, even if originally published in Greek, was also available in a Latin version (see introduction to Fabius Pictor (1), I. 169). This conclusion is borne out by passages in which Fabius is included in discussions of Latin historical style, such as those of Cicero and Fronto (see GT 2 and 6).

The relatively numerous fragments and extensive testimonia make it possible to reconstruct some aspects of the basic outline, structure, and characteristics of Cato's *Origines*. Of particular importance is the summary of the work given in Nepos' life of Cato, from his work on Latin Historians (T1). By combining Nepos' summary with other testimonia and with the evidence of the fragments themselves we can form a general idea of the work, but the resulting picture is far from straightforward and presents us with some formidable problems. The first concerns the date and circumstances of composition.

The *Origines*: the date and circumstances of composition

A number of sources make it clear beyond reasonable doubt that the *Origines* was the work of Cato's old age. The most explicit is Cornelius Nepos (T1), who says that Cato began to write histories as an old man (*senex*). The last of the seven books contained an account of recent events, including the 'trial' of Servius Galba in 149 BC (T13e).[11] According to Cicero (*Brut.* 89=T13a) Cato inserted into the *Origines* a version of his speech against Galba 'a few days or months before his death' (*paucis antequam mortuus est an diebus an mensibus*). One fragment (F55), almost certainly from book 2 or book 3, refers to the Third Macedonian War (171–167 BC), and therefore provides a *terminus post quem* for that part of the work (but see further below). More generally, Cicero presents Cato in the *De senectute* (set in 150 BC) as engaged in intense literary study and historical research for the *Origines* (T6a). Cicero was careful to ensure an authentic setting for his dialogues, and he is unlikely to have been seriously mistaken on a point of this nature. The general conclusion must be that Cato composed the *Origines* in the last years of his life, probably in the 150s but in any case not earlier than the 160s.

Note should be taken, however, of two testimonia that appear to conflict with this conclusion. The first of these is T8, a speech which Livy puts into the mouth of L. Valerius Tappo, a tribune of 195 BC, during the debate on the repeal of the *lex Oppia*. This was a sumptuary law, passed in 215 BC at the height of the Hannibalic War, which had imposed severe restrictions on women's expenditure, particularly on

[11] 'Trial' is strictly a misnomer but is convenient shorthand for the episode in which a tribune of the plebs, L. Scribonius Libo, proposed a law to set up a special court to try him. The speeches for and against the proposal (including Cato's speech *Contra Galbam*) inevitably rehearsed the charges against Galba, and the *contio* at which the speeches were delivered came to resemble a trial before the people (*iudicium populi*)—which is how the event is wrongly described by some of our sources (see Briscoe, *Comm.* 3. 354, on Livy 39.40.12).

clothing and jewellery. Cato, as consul in 195, strongly opposed the attempt to repeal the law, in the event unsuccessfully. In Livy's dramatic account of this affair, Valerius Tappo takes Cato to task for defending an outdated measure. In the course of his speech he argues that the women of Rome deserve better and cites examples of historical occasions on which they had intervened to save the state (the Sabine maidens, the mother of Coriolanus, etc.). With a dramatic flourish the tribune brandishes a copy of Cato's *Origines*, and unrolls it to reveal passages where these famous incidents were recounted. But the whole speech is patently a rhetorical composition by Livy himself, as is his version of Cato's;[12] and the general implication that the *Origines* had already been completed and published by 195, which goes against all the rest of the evidence, must be regarded as a flagrant anachronism.[13]

The other text is from Plutarch (T6b), who tells us that Cato had written his 'histories' for the benefit of his elder son 'in his own handwriting and in large letters'. Cato's elder son was born in 192 BC, and the 'histories' in question must have been written when he was still a small boy, if he needed to read them in large letters. The apparent conflict between this information and the rest of the evidence for the date of composition can be resolved in a number of ways. Although the passage occurs in an account of Cato's efforts to educate his elder son, it may be that Plutarch was mistaken, and that Cato was actually referring to his younger son (by his second marriage), who was born around 155 BC. It is just about possible that Cato could have written the *Origines* (or at least a simplified version of all or part of it) for this child when he was learning to read. A second possibility is that the 'histories' in question were not the *Origines*, but a separate work, a basic account of Roman history suitable for a small boy, which may or may not have been published as part of the *Libri ad filium*. A slightly different way of saying the same thing would be to describe the *Origines* as an expanded and elaborated version of an elementary history that Cato had produced for his son many years before. Some explanation along these lines seems the most likely.[14]

A different approach to the problem is represented by the idea that the *Origines* was composed over a long period of time, and that the first part was written in the 180s for the benefit of Cato's young son. Ernst Badian lent his authority to this view, arguing that 'book I (the early history of Rome, self-contained and most suitable for Cato's purpose) was written first, and for this purpose, in the 180s, and the rest added later'.[15] As it stands this suggestion is perhaps not very likely. There is nothing to

[12] Astin, *Cato*, 25–6; Briscoe, *Comm.* 2. 39–42, and 56 on Liv. 34.5.7; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 70; P. A. Johnston, *TAPA* 110 (1980), 147 n. 9; M. T. Sblendorio Cugusi, P. Cugusi, *BSL* 26.1 (1996), 96.

[13] On the other hand the possibility that the historical exempla cited by Livy's tribune were indeed narrated in the *Origines* should not be ruled out.

[14] Accepted e.g. by Peter 1. cxxix–cxxx; Timpe, *AAP* 83 (1970–1), 11; Chassignet, *Les Origines*, ix. Note also D. Sansone's commentary on Plutarch: *Aristeides and Cato* (Warminster, 1989), 225, on 47.7. It is noteworthy that Plutarch cites Cato himself as the authority for the story in T6b (*φησὶν αὐτός*: 'he himself says'). This probably refers to some passage in the *libri ad filium*, in which Cato reminded his son about his early upbringing. But it is not impossible to imagine that Cato might have mentioned his first venture into historical writing in the preface to the *Origines*. If so, this passage would count as a possible fragment. But the possibility is so remote that we have decided, on balance, not to include it as such in this edition.

[15] Badian, 'Early historians', 31 n. 44.

support the description of book 1 as 'self-contained' and no reason why it, or indeed any other part of the finished work, would have been particularly suitable for Cato's pedagogic purpose. On the other hand there *are* grounds for supposing that the finished work was the product of long gestation and that it was composed in stages rather than all at once in accordance with a predetermined plan. On this view the process of composition had a bearing on the work's structure, a thorny issue to which we must now turn.

The *Origines*: general problems of organization and structure

Severe problems attend the questions of how Cato's work was organized and what the various sections contained. These issues require extensive discussion. Only a minority of the fragments are cited with a book number, and most of these with no clear indication of the context. The inferences that can be drawn from fragments with book numbers, combined with the evidence of external testimonia such as Nepos' summary (T1), are generally insufficient to allow the contents of the various books, and the arrangement of material within the books, to be reconstructed with any confidence. The few relatively certain facts can be briefly outlined.

It is reasonable to suppose that book 1 contained an account of the legendary origins and early history of Rome (thus Nepos, together with the evidence of numbered fragments, e.g. F9, F15, F18); but it is far from clear whether, and if so how far, book 1 also extended beyond Rome to deal with other communities (see F23–6, with commentary on F25–6). Fragments explicitly attributed to books 2 and 3 are sufficient to confirm Nepos' statement that these books were concerned with the cities and peoples of Italy; but there can be no certainty about the precise scope of each of the two books or about how they were organized internally. As for the later books, Nepos says that 4 and 5 contained the First and Second Punic Wars (respectively), and that the remaining books dealt with subsequent wars. But this very general description is only partially confirmed by the fragments with book numbers. These show that book 4 contained an episode of the First Punic War (F76), the outbreak of the Second (F77), and the aftermath of Cannae (F79). The only numbered fragments of book 5 that can be assigned a historical context are the seven extracts (F87–93) from Cato's speech *pro Rhodiensibus* of 167 BC. Book 6 is a complete blank (only the uninformative F103 survives), while the one certain historical event in book 7 is the trial of Galba in 149 (F104). Beyond this we can say only that book 5 dealt in some way with Illyria (F94, F99), and book 7 with Spain (F111). How these various pieces of evidence are to be interpreted and made to fit any more detailed reconstruction will be discussed fully in what follows.

A basic problem concerning the structure of Cato's *Origines* arises from the title of the work, which appears to give only a partial description of its contents. Festus (T7) notes that the work was mostly concerned with historical events (*res gestae*), and that they largely predominated over the parts dealing with origins (*origines*). Cornelius Nepos (T1) implies something similar when he says that Cato called the whole work 'Origins' because of the content of the early books. But we should be aware that Festus and Nepos were not necessarily making exactly the same point. Although Nepos says that the first book contained *res gestae*, we cannot assume that he drew a contrast between *res gestae* and *origines*, as Festus did. Nepos may have meant that the first

book, on the kings, also contained 'origins'; it depends on how his text is punctuated and what he intended as the antecedent of *ob quam rem*. For his part Cicero defined the first book as the 'origin of the Roman people' (*origo populi Romani*: T10/F131), and there is reason to think that the origins of some places near Rome were also included in book 1 (see below). In other words, the work began with three books of 'origins', including the origins of Rome in book 1.

This may suggest a contrast between books 1–3 on the one hand, and the later books (4–7) on the other. The implied separation of the work into two distinct parts is accentuated by a number of other features, most notably by the fact that in Nepos' account of its contents, the work dealt with the history of Rome to the end of the monarchy in book 1, and took up the story again in book 4 with the First Punic War. In this scheme there is no place for the first two and a half centuries of the republic (509–264 BC). Even if a brief summary of this long period was inserted somewhere,[16] the work as a whole still seems virtually to fall in half. The possibility that book 4 marked a new start is consistent with the widely held view that it had a new preface; this is considered by all previous editors and commentators to be the most likely context for the famous fragment in which Cato ridicules the archive of the Pontifex Maximus (F80). The fragment is generally thought to come from a prefatory discussion of the nature and value of the available sources for the historical narrative that follows in the remainder of the work.

Taken together, the evidence has been thought to indicate that Cato first set out to write a work about origins (1–3), and that the books on more recent history (4–7) were added at a later stage and as an afterthought, and that they contained a different kind of history altogether.[17] A more radical version of this theory maintains that the two parts were written by Cato as entirely separate works, and were combined into a single whole only by a posthumous editor, who applied the title of the first work, *Origines*, to the resulting compilation.[18]

This 'separatist' theory can be reinforced by the widely canvassed notion that the first three books were written at the time of the Third Macedonian War (171–167 BC). This would allow for a considerable interval between the dates of the two parts of the work (or, in the more extreme version, between the two works). The evidence for dating the early books to the time of the Third Macedonian War comes from the elder Pliny (*nat.* 3.114), who writes: *Ameriam supra scriptam Cato ante Persei bellum conditam annis DCCCCLXIII prodit* ('Cato reports that the above-mentioned Ameria was founded nine hundred and sixty-three years before the war with Perseus'). Strictly speaking this fragment (F55) is proof of no more than that the relevant part of the *Origines* (presumably from book 2 or 3, since it concerns the foundation of an Umbrian city) was written later than the Third Macedonian War.[19] But many

[16] Astin (*Cato*, 215) suggests that Cato included a brief outline of the early history of the republic 'probably at the beginning of book 4'.

[17] Thus Leo, *GRL* (1913), 294; Peter 1. cxxxix; Badian, 'Early historians', 7, 9; Timpe, *AAP* 83 (1970–1), 14–15.

[18] This radical theory was first formulated by M. Schanz, *Gesch. röm. Lit.* (2nd edn., Munich, 1898), 128. A watered-down version can be found in Schanz–Hosius, 186–9; see also Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 163–9; Helm, *RE* 22 (1953), 160–1; Meister, *AAHW* 101 (1964), 1–8. Nowadays rather unfashionable, it still reappears from time to time, e.g. in A. S. Gratwick, *CHCL* 2.1 (Cambridge, 1982), 150.

[19] Thus rightly De Sanctis, *SR* 62 n. 140; Timpe, *AAP* 83 (1970–1), 11; Astin, *Cato*, 212; 216 n. 19.

commentators believe that Cato would not have chosen this event as the starting point for his calculation of the date of the founding of Ameria unless it had special significance at the time of writing, most probably because at the time of writing the war against Perseus was still going on, or at least had only recently ended.[20] As the fragment is not a verbatim quotation, we cannot be sure what Cato actually wrote. It is possible that he said simply that Ameria had been founded 963 years before his time, and that the identification of the time of writing with the war against Perseus was Pliny's gloss.[21]

This interpretation of the fragment is certainly possible, but it cannot be regarded as certain or even probable. The point that the Third Macedonian War had some special significance is well taken, but other explanations are equally possible. One is that Cato initially planned a historical work covering the period down to the defeat of Perseus (occupying books 1–5, books 6–7 being a continuation, in the manner of Polybius; on this see further below), and that this terminal event became the standard reference point for dating earlier events.[22] In other words, the Third Macedonian War signified not the time of writing, which could have been at any subsequent point down to Cato's death, but the planned termination of the historical narrative.

Other possible explanations could easily be conjectured (see commentary on F55). What matters for the present discussion is that the fragment cannot be held to prove that Cato was writing the second or third book in the early 160s, still less that there was an interval between the completion of the books on Italian origins and the composition of books 4–7. Without this chronological argument the case for saying that the work was composed in two distinct stages is seriously weakened. As for the theory that Cato wrote two separate works that were combined only after his death, the case is now virtually non-existent; and there are two decisive objections to it. First it conflicts with the surviving evidence. All the sources without exception take it for granted that the *Origines* in its transmitted form was planned and written by Cato as a single work. The most explicit text is the passage of Cicero's *Cato Maior* (T6a) in which the elderly Cato is made to say that he is working on the seventh book of his *Origines*. Second, the theory is unnecessary. To put it another way, the problem is not sufficiently acute to require such a radical solution. That Cato wrote a single historical work in seven books containing the topics outlined by Cornelius Nepos (T1) is perfectly conceivable; what needs to be explained is why he chose to concentrate on certain topics and why he organized them as he did.[23]

There is more to be said for the weak version of the separatist theory, namely the idea that the work was divided into two unequal halves, and that the second (books 4–7) represented a change of direction and contained a different kind of history.[24] On this view Cato prefaced his historical narrative with an account of the origins of

[20] e.g. Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 5, 518; Peter 1. cxxxix; Leo, *GRL*, 291; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 164; Helm, *RE* 22 (1953), 160; Meister, *AAWW* 101 (1964), 3.

[21] The argument is set out by F. Della Corte, *Catone Censore* (1969), 153.

[22] This, if we understand him correctly, is the view of Kierdorf, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 220; cf. also Flach, *RGS* 72; Cugusi 1. 52 n. 246.

[23] The unity of the *Origines* is now generally accepted, e.g. by Timpe, *AAP* 83 (1970–1), 12–14, 31–2; Astin, *Cato*, 216, 218–19; Kierdorf, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 220; Chassignet, *Les Origines*, xix; Cugusi 1, 50; Sbardella, *StudRom* 51 (2003), 12–13.

[24] For a clear statement of this view see Cugusi 1. 50.

Rome and Italy in books 1–3. There would have been nothing unprecedented about a historical work organized in this way. Greek historiography offered many examples of works in which historical narrative of recent events was preceded by a discursive account of the remote historical background. Herodotus is an obvious case in point. Another is Timaeus, who prefaced his narrative of the history of the western Greeks with an account of the geography, ethnography, and early history of the peoples of the western Mediterranean in his first five books.[25] Timaeus may have served as a model for Cato, as well as a major source. In other words, the separation of Cato's work into two distinct parts, three books of origins, followed by four books of recent historical narrative, may have been planned from the outset, and need not represent a change of direction in the course of its composition. This conclusion would still be valid even if Cato left out the history of the early republic.

The narrative section (books 4–7) began with the First Punic War, the first war that Rome fought outside Italy and as head of a unified Italian alliance. This is scarcely an accident, and it may be that Cato considered an account of the geography, ethnography, and earliest history of Rome and Italy to be a suitable background to the main narrative. If book 4 began with a new preface, its purpose might have been to introduce the narrative section, not necessarily to indicate that there had been a change in plan. But as a matter of fact there is no evidence that this 'new preface' ever existed (see commentary on F80), and the whole idea that the work fell into two unequal halves, with three books of origins being followed by four books of narrative, is far from secure.

So far we have considered only two possible forms of arrangement for the work as a whole: either two books of 'origins' (2–3) and five (1 and 4–7) of narrative, or three books of 'origins' (1–3) and four (4–7) of narrative, with a slight preference for the latter. But other divisions or subdivisions may also be considered. One possibility that has already been mentioned is that the first five books represent Cato's original plan, ending with the conclusion of the Third Macedonian War, and that the last two books were an afterthought added at the end of Cato's life continuing the story to 149 BC. If so, the original version of the work had two books of narrative (4–5) preceded by three books of 'origins' (1–3).

This hypothetical reconstruction would account for a number of otherwise problematic features of the evidence. First, the title is more appropriate to a work in which three books out of five were devoted to origins. Second, it would explain the use of the war against Perseus, the culminating event of the history, as the reference point for dating other events (see above). Third, it makes some sense of the puzzling distribution of material in the later books. The increased scale of the last two books, covering the period from 167 to 149, is explained if they represent an unfinished continuation in which Cato recorded contemporary events as and when they happened, and if they remained unfinished and unrevised at the time of his death.

[25] Fragments of Timaeus can be found at *FGrHist* 566; Jacoby's introduction and commentary are indispensable. See further T. S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Berkeley, 1958); A. Momigliano, *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford, 1977), 37–66; L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West* (Atlanta, Ga., 1987); R. Vattuone, *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero di Timeo di Tauromenio* (Bologna, 1991); id. in R. Vattuone (ed.), *Storici greci d'Occidente* (Bologna, 2002), 177–232.

The two previous books cover a much greater span, from 264 to 167 BC, but could have contained a succinct outline of the first two Punic Wars and the wars that followed, thus summarizing the main stages of the growth of the Roman empire.

Cornelius Nepos says that book 4 contained the First Punic War and book 5 the Second; but this statement is demonstrably misleading, if not completely wrong, because fragments dealing with the outbreak of the Second Punic War and with the aftermath of Cannae are quoted from book 4, while book 5 included Cato's speech on behalf of the Rhodians (167 BC).[26] It is nevertheless likely that the Second Punic War held centre stage, and that Cato's account of it occupied the second part of book 4 and the first part of book 5.[27] The latter book then continued with a summary account of the wars of expansion,[28] including Cato's Spanish campaigns in 195–4. Cato was able to write about most of these events as a contemporary and indeed a major participant, and we know from Livy and Plutarch that he did not stint his own praises.[29] The book probably ended with the debate on the Rhodians after the Third Macedonian War, in which Cato's intervention (his speech was apparently reproduced verbatim in the *Origines*: see n. 26) was decisive in shaping the future direction of Roman foreign policy.

A fourth argument in favour of this general reconstruction is that the conclusion of the Third Macedonian War was widely recognized in later years as a major historical turning point and indeed the end of an epoch. The clearest evidence for this is Polybius, who also famously saw the fall of Macedon as the final stage in the growth of Roman power (e.g. 3.4.2). That Cato shared this opinion need not surprise us. Agreement between them should be seen neither as a remarkable coincidence nor necessarily as evidence that one influenced the other (although it is more than possible that they had discussed the matter and that each knew what the other thought about it). It is altogether most likely that the events of 168–167 BC were generally recognized at the time as epoch-making and that this idea was common currency in educated circles. If so we might also suppose that Polybius was not alone in deciding to reassess his plan and to continue his work beyond the original closing point of 168–167 BC. Cato may well have done the same, and added two further books to the five that comprised his initial scheme.

In spite of its attractions, however, this reconstruction remains a speculative hypothesis, and cannot be regarded as in any way secure. The trouble is that in spite of a relatively large number of fragments and testimonia we are still very poorly informed about what the books of the *Origines* contained and how they were organized. The various possibilities discussed above all share two basic assumptions:

[26] F77, on the outbreak of the Hannibalic War, is cited from book 4 by Gellius (10.1.10) and Nonius (100M = 142L.); F79, on the events after Cannae, is also cited from book 4 by Gellius (2.19.9). Cato's speech *Pro Rhodiensibus* (F187–93) was included in book 5 according to Livy (T12a) and Gellius (T12b).

[27] For the centrality of the Hannibalic War in Cato's *Origines* cf. G. Nenci in *Studi annibalici* (Cortona 1964), 71–81.

[28] Nepos says that the two Punic Wars were narrated *capitulatim* (i.e., probably, 'in broad outline'), and that the remaining wars were dealt with 'in the same fashion' (*reliquaque bella pari modo persecutus est*).

[29] See T21a–b. Note that Livy and Plutarch do not explicitly attribute Cato's version of these events to the *Origines*. They are therefore included only as 'possible fragments' (F133, 135–6). On this issue, and on Cato's autobiographical writings in general, see Cornell in Smith and Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (2009), 15–40, esp. 21–7, and l. 214–15.

that books 4–7 were arranged chronologically, and that the books on Italian origins had a systematic, probably geographical arrangement (the most widely held view being that book 2 covered northern Italy and book 3 the South).[30] But both assumptions are fragile, and neither has much support in the evidence. What is more, there is no evidence to support even the general proposition that the books on Italian origins were organized differently from the later books, although this idea underlies all the separatist theories that in one form or another have dominated modern scholarship on the *Origines*, and are presupposed in all previous editions of the fragments.

Other possibilities exist, and have occasionally been advanced, especially by scholars who are keen to emphasize the unity of the work, not only in the sense that its final form was consciously devised by Cato, but in the more radical sense that it was arranged according to a consistent and uniform pattern throughout. There are essentially two versions of this 'unitarian' approach. The first is that the entire work was organized within a chronological framework. On this view, which is now distinctly unfashionable although it was revived by Kierdorf in 1980,[31] the first three books contained a chronological account of Rome's wars in Italy from the beginning, interspersed with digressions on the origins of the peoples who fought against her and were successively subdued. Book 1 would have covered the regal period, and the origins of the cities and peoples who fought against the kings, while books 2 and 3 would have carried the story on through the republic down to the final conquest of Italy in 264 BC. The chronological outline of Rome's major wars could have provided the framework for descriptive excurses on the geography, ethnography, and early history of all the major groups of Italian peoples who were finally incorporated in the Roman alliance. The evidence of numbered fragments (see n. 30) can be reconciled with a chronological arrangement by supposing that Cisalpine Gaul and Liguria (in book 2) were discussed in connection with the Gallic Wars of the fourth century, while the fragment concerning Rhegium (from book 3) would have been linked to the war against Pyrrhus and Rome's dealings with the Greek cities of the South.

The later books on this theory would have contained a chronological narrative of the Punic Wars and the wars of imperial expansion, but would also have continued the pattern of the earlier books by including digressions on the peoples and places in the wider Mediterranean basin that by Cato's time had fallen under the sway of Rome. This important conclusion seems to be supported by the evidence of fragments dealing with the geography and institutions of North Africa (including Carthage), Spain, and Illyria.[32] Assuming that Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia were also covered, we might conclude that Cato's *Origines* contained a chronological account of the growth of the Roman empire, including ethno-geographical accounts of the origins of all the peoples of the western Mediterranean who were now under Rome's protection or

[30] This conclusion is based on the evidence of numbered fragments. Book 2 evidently included Cisalpine Gaul (F30–1), Liguria (F33–4), old Latium (F36, F40), the Abruzzi peoples (F39), and Arpinum (F35). The only fragment from book 3 that can be located geographically deals with the territory of Rhegium (F45).

[31] Kierdorf, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 213–20. Earlier versions can be found in von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* 5. 520–1; C. Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte* (1894), 625; Beloch, *RG* 102.

[32] Carthage and North Africa: F84, F148; possibly also F81, F85, 139. Spain: F111, F116; possibly also F128. Illyria: F94, F99.

control. Whether it also included something similar on Greece, Asia Minor, and the eastern Mediterranean cannot be known, but it seems unlikely, on general grounds: if Cato had written anything in the *Origines* about the geography, ethnography, or institutions of the Greeks we should almost certainly know about it. The explanation would be that Rome's adventures in the East had resulted in no permanent commitments, in contrast to the West, where Roman rule was firmly established by annexations or networks of alliances.

An alternative version of the unitarian approach assumes that the arrangement of the whole work was not chronological, but geographical. What Cato would have presented, according to this theory, was a systematic description of the Roman empire, with each area being treated in turn. Geographical and ethnographic description could have been combined with an account of the origins and early history of the various cities and peoples, down to and including their dealings with the Romans, until they were finally absorbed into the Roman system. The end result would have been much the same: an account of the growth of the Roman empire, but in geographical rather than chronological order. The distribution of the material between the various books would be a matter for conjecture, but Italy would have been covered in 1–3, the provinces and the wider empire in 4–7.[33]

A rather more subtle and indeed persuasive form of the unitary thesis combines the chronological and geographical approaches, by supposing that Cato's work was devoted to the study of Rome's wars (this indeed is implicit in Nepos' description of the later books, where he refers exclusively to *bella*), and that the wars were grouped so that the successive wars against each enemy (e.g. Gallic Wars, Punic Wars, Macedonian Wars, Spanish Wars) were narrated together. The narrative within each war or series of wars would have been chronological, and the series themselves set out in roughly chronological order. Thus, after the wars of the kings in book 1, book 2 would have dealt with the wars of the early republic (e.g. Latin Wars, Aequian and Volscian Wars, Gallic invasions), book 3 with the later stages of the Roman conquest of Italy (e.g. Samnite Wars, Pyrrhic War). Books 4–5 would have contained the Punic and Macedonian Wars to 167 BC, and book 7 the Spanish Wars, including Cato's own campaign in 195–194, down to the massacre of the Lusitanians by Galba and its repercussions (see comm. on F111 for the possibility that all the Spanish Wars were included together in book 7). The content of the mysterious book 6 (from which we have only one uninformative fragment (F103)) can only be conjectured. The war against Antiochus, in which Cato himself played a prominent part, is a possibility, and some room would have had to be found for the wars in Cisalpine Gaul and Liguria in the second century, if these were not already covered in book 2.[34] As Niebuhr recognized long ago, Cato's *Origines* could have provided a model for

[33] Thus Bormann, 57; Schwegler, *RG* 1. 81; L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma* 1 (Turin, 1952), 30.

[34] Thus e.g. Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 5. 525; Schanz–Hosius 1. 187–9 (both suggesting the war against Antiochus for book 6). In an important contribution Plinio Fraccaro suggested that book 5 contained the conclusion of the Hannibalic War followed by all of Rome's wars in the East; the remainder of the work dealt with the West, with the wars in Cisalpine Gaul and Liguria in book 6, and the Spanish wars in book 7 (Fraccaro, *Opuscula* 1. 193–8).

Appian, whose history was also organized by wars, and whose first three books dealt respectively with the wars of the kings, the Italian Wars, and the Samnite Wars.[35]

These various unitary hypotheses are attractive not only on their own terms but because they help to resolve otherwise problematic aspects of the evidence. If the work as a whole was concerned principally with wars, and if books 2 and 3 contained an account of Rome's wars in Italy, then there would have been no hiatus between the end of the monarchy and the First Punic War. The unity of the work, which would have been evident enough if the theme of war was carried through from start to finish, would have been further enhanced by the presence of digressions on origins, which it seems were not confined to the early books, but occurred in the later ones as well. Festus' remark in T7 about the title of the work is not a major difficulty here; he may not have meant that the title applied to only some of the books, but rather that 'origins' formed a minority theme running through the work, and that in the work as a whole historical narrative (*res gestae*) predominated. If so his point was a pedantic one; the passages dealing with origins were what gave the work its distinctive character, and even if they occupied less space than the narrative their presence would still have justified the use of the title *Origines*. As for Cornelius Nepos, we can interpret his comment to mean that the sections on origins were more heavily concentrated in the early books than in the rest of the work.

The *Origines*: form, content, and character of individual sections. (a) Books 1–3

We have argued that the first three books were devoted to origins—of Rome in the first book and of other Italian peoples in books 2–3. In itself this is not a very controversial claim, and seemingly little different from the alternative, that early Roman history occupied book 1 while books 2 and 3 were devoted to Italian origins. But the distinction raises the awkward and actually far from trivial question of whether Cato counted Rome as part of Italy. The answer that is given to this question entails profound consequences for the organization of the *Origines*, and severe practical implications for the ordering of the surviving fragments. For instance, F74 deals with the etymology of *Italia*. It is reasonable to suppose that this occurred at the start of Cato's account of Italy, but it is an open question whether this was placed in book 1 or book 2. A similar issue arises with F49 and F63, which concern the Aborigines, the earliest inhabitants of Italy. Although it cannot be certain, it is likely that Cato dealt with the Aborigines in book 1 (which is where previous editors have placed F49 and F63) for two reasons: first, the Aborigines also occur in F24, quoted by Priscian (twice) from book 1, and secondly because the Aborigines play their part in the Roman foundation legend, as the people encountered by Aeneas and the Trojans when they landed in Italy. The Aeneas legend itself (F4–12) must have been covered in book 1 as part of the story of the origins of Rome, a conclusion confirmed by the fact that F9, dealing with Mezentius, Aeneas' Etruscan enemy, is ascribed by Macrobius to book 1.

On the other hand, it would be perfectly possible to imagine a structure in which the origins and early history of Rome were treated in isolation in book 1, the story

[35] Appian, *praef.* 14; Niebuhr, *Hist. Rom.* 1². 8 n. 2.

beginning with Aeneas and his adventures, and introducing Latinus, Mezentius, and their followers as they entered the story, but nevertheless postponing for books 2 and 3 the dedicated treatment of the Aborigines, Latins, and Etruscans. Some compromises along these lines are inevitable: Mezentius was Etruscan, but it would not be reasonable to infer from his appearance in book 1 that Cato's whole account of Etruria and the Etruscans occurred in that book.[36] A similar issue arises in the case of the Sabines, who must have been mentioned in Cato's account of the reign of Romulus; nevertheless it remains uncertain whether the discussion of the origins of the Sabines (F50–1) occurred there, in book 1, or in the account of Italian origins in books 2–3.[37]

Even if book 1 was dedicated exclusively to the origins and early history of Rome, it would have been impossible in practice to treat the city in complete isolation, and without any reference at all to surrounding peoples and places. As it happens, the fragments with book numbers make it clear that book 1 referred to Alba Longa (F15), Capena (F23), the Aborigines and the land of the Volsci (F24), Tusculum (F25), and Antemnae (F26). Although these could all have been mentioned in passing in the course of a narrative centred on Rome, that is not the only possible explanation. A plausible alternative is that book 1 was the first of three books on origins, and began, after the preface, with a general introduction on Italy, its name, geography, earliest inhabitants, and so on. On this view the Aeneas legend (F4–12) would have formed part of an account of the origins of the Latins (of which F63 is perhaps a summary), into which the origins of places such as Lavinium and Alba could have fitted. While the history of Rome under the kings must have occupied a large part of the book (T1, F15, F18, and probably F13–17), there would have been room for the origins of other peoples and places in Old Latium, either arranged in a geographically organized survey of places in the vicinity of Rome, or inserted as digressions in a broadly chronological narrative. Examples might include Tibur (F61) and Politorium (F65), which Cato connected directly with the legends of Evander and Aeneas respectively.

While it is probable that book 1 included the origins of peoples and places other than Rome, this reconstruction remains hypothetical, and in any case cannot be taken too far. For instance, it is likely that the fragment recording the dedication of the shrine of Diana at Aricia belongs to book 2 (F36).[38] If so there can be no suggestion that Old Latium as a whole was included in book 1; book 2 must also have dealt with some Latin places. This is confirmed by F40, quoted by Priscian (twice) from book 2, which deals with the territory of Tibur. This may mean that F61, on the foundation of Tibur, also belongs in book 2, rather than in book 1 as suggested above. But our ignorance of these matters is so great that nothing can be taken as certain. It is perfectly possible that the foundation legend of Tibur occurred in book 1, but that the agricultural practices of its territory were featured in a discussion of the rural economy of Latium in book 2 (cf. commentary). Where nothing is certain, anything is possible.

[36] Etruscan fragments include F70–2, but possibly also F47 and F49 (see comm. ad loc.), both cited from book 2.

[37] Notice that while Peter, Chassignet, and Cugusi include F50–1 in book 2, Jordan placed them in book 1.

[38] Likely, but not completely certain. Priscian quotes the text in two different places, once from book 2 (F36a) and once from book 1 (F36b). For discussion of this issue, and for reasons to prefer the version of F36a to that of F36b, see the commentary on the fragment; and for a comment on Priscian's reliability in the matter of book numbers see the entry on Priscian in Section 4 of the General Introduction (I. 114–15).

A related problem arises with F25, the grant of Roman citizenship to L. Mamilius of Tusculum in 458 BC. The presence of an event of 458 BC is usually taken to show that book 1 extended beyond the fall of the monarchy to include the early decades of the republic. One attractive theory is that it covered the same period as Polybius' so-called archaeologia (i.e. the account of early Rome in book 6, unfortunately now lost) and the second book of Cicero's *Republic* (T10)—that is, the period down to 449 BC in which the republican constitution was formed.[39] But there can be no certainty about this, or even about the notion that the account of Roman history in book 1 extended to 458 BC. The context of F25 is unknown, and we must reckon with the possibility that it comes not from a Rome-centred narrative of events, but from an account of the origins of Tusculum (see commentary).

Turning now to the organization and content of books 2 and 3, we need once again to acknowledge that we are very poorly informed by external testimonia,[40] and that the information provided by the fragments is severely limited by the fact that they are almost all quoted out of context. This means that, in spite of a number of more or less plausible modern hypotheses (see above), we have no way of knowing for certain how the material relating to the peoples of Italy was organized. If the arrangement was broadly geographical, in what order did Cato proceed? Were the two books subdivided into regions? The standard modern interpretation (followed by all previous editors) is that Cato dealt with North Italy in book 2 and the South in book 3, and within each book moved consistently in a north–south direction; but this reconstruction is not supported by either evidence or probability. Other ways of describing the country and its constituent regions are possible, notably the itinerary and the *periplus* or *periegesis*. It is enough to recall the arrangement of Pliny, who in book 3 of the *Natural History* dealt with each of the Augustan regions in turn, and separated the coastal settlements, which he listed in geographical order, from the inland ones, which he listed in alphabetical order (see commentary on F53–60).[41]

On the other hand, if the arrangement was broadly chronological we should have to imagine a Rome-centred narrative of events following the progress of the Roman conquest, interspersed with ethno-geographical digressions of each region and the origins of its communities. A more subtle combination of the chronological and geographical modes of arrangement is required by the theory that the work was divided into theatres of war, with descriptions of the geography, ethnography, culture, and legendary origins of each region and people combined with a narrative account of the military actions that resulted in their conquest by the Romans. As noted earlier

[39] For this interpretation see Timpe, *AAP* 83 (1971), 20; id. *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 938–40; Kierdorf, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 212–13; J.-L. Ferrary, *JRS* 74 (1984), 89; Cornell in J. G. F. Powell, J. A. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic* (London, 2001), 46–7.

[40] Apart from Nepos' summary in T1, all the available testimonies are printed in T11a–e.

[41] Cf. Williams, *Beyond the Rubicon* (2001), 49–50. Strabo's account of Italy in book 5 of the *Geography* also deals with the country region by region. He starts with Cisalpine Gaul and Liguria (5.1.3–12, 211–18), taking the Transpadane and Cispadane sectors in turn and moving in each case from west to east; he then goes on to describe the regions on the Tyrrhenian side of Italy down as far as the borders of Campania (5.2.1–3.13, 218–40), before returning to the Adriatic side and dealing with the regions of the east coast from Cisalpine Gaul to the borders of Apulia (5.4.1–2, 240–2). Finally he proceeds successively and in turn to Campania, Samnium, Lucania, Bruttium, and Magna Graecia.

(I. 204, and n. 34), this pattern could have been continued throughout the work to include Cato's account of the Punic and subsequent wars in books 4–7.

Further speculation about the internal structure of various parts of the work would be fruitless, given the inadequacy of the evidence. The main purpose of this discussion has been to stress the level of our ignorance in this regard, and therefore to justify the extreme caution we believe is necessary when ordering the fragments (see below). There is scope for greater confidence, however, when it comes to assessing the interests that are revealed by the surviving fragments, and the character of individual parts of the work, however organized.

One thing we can be certain of is that Cato's account of peoples and places was concerned with far more than foundation legends. The fragments show that he also dealt with physical geography (F62, 111, 150), climate (116, 141), flora and fauna (F31, 47, 75, 121, 122, 142), agricultural practices and all forms of natural produce (F38, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 99, 100, 111, 116, 129), social customs (F30, 33, 43, 84, 109, 128, 151), political, military, and legal institutions (F35, 81, 85, 112, 134, 148), and wonders (*admiranda*) (T1, F47, 75, 98, 116). Cato probably also included lists of tribes and towns, and was concerned to establish the ethnic identity, linguistic connections, and mythical kinship of the peoples and places he studied.[42] Much of this material was based on first-hand research and personal observation, and represented living tradition as well as description of the peoples of Italy as Cato saw them.[43]

This conclusion is based not only on the character of the relevant fragments, but also on the fact that there is no realistic alternative. Cato was the first Roman historian to study the peoples of Italy, and his account of them cannot have been based to any great extent on earlier Roman writers. Greek sources were available, it is true, and it is likely enough that information about the legends, history, and ethnography of the Italian peoples was present in the works of Greek writers, especially the historians of the West, such as Antiochus of Syracuse and Timaeus. But their accounts had naturally had their centre of gravity in the cities of Magna Graecia, and even those historians who showed a wider interest in the non-Greek peoples of Italy, especially Timaeus, tended to adopt a 'Hellenocentric' approach. That is to say, they attempted to reconstruct early history by integrating the origins of all peoples, Greeks and barbarians, into a unified and ordered system based on the myths and legends of the Greek heroic age.[44] The prehistory of Italy was presented as a story of successive waves of migration led by heroes such as Heracles, Evander, the Argonauts, and the survivors of the Trojan War. The resulting alliances and conflicts between the immigrants and the native peoples were thought to have created the different populations, ethnic groups, and major settlements that emerged in Italy in historical times. A good idea of how this was done can be found in the first book of the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[45] as well as in the relevant sections of

[42] Lists of tribes and towns: F56, 59; ethnic identity: F57, 60; linguistic connections: F70; mythical kinship: F39, 49–51, 53, 58, 69.

[43] See comm. on F30, 33, 34, 35, 55, 116.

[44] See Cornell, *Beginnings*, 37–41. The term 'Hellenocentric' was first used in this context by E. J. Bickerman, *CPh* 47 (1952), 65–81 (= *Religions and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Como, 1985), 399–417)—a classic article that opened a new chapter in the history of Greek thought.

[45] DH was following earlier Greek sources. In the course of his account he cites Hellanicus, Antiochus, Philistus, and Timaeus.

Diodorus and Strabo, whose accounts of early Italy drew upon the works of early Greek historians, and particularly Timaeus.[46]

It is true that some fragments of Cato's *Origines* link the origins of Italian peoples and places with Greek heroes in a Hellenocentric manner, and it may well be that he took some of this information from Timaeus, whom he is likely to have read and who may have inspired him to incorporate ethno-geographical material in a historical work (see I. 201). Polybius is critical of earlier Greek historians who enlivened their accounts by including discussions of genealogies, colonies, foundations, and kinship links, in contrast to his own practice of concentrating exclusively on political events (9.1–2). Ephorus is mentioned by name (9.1.4), but it is clear that he also had Timaeus in mind, as we learn from 12.26d.1–6; in this passage he says that Timaeus had many admirers who were taken in by his plausible rhetoric and his professions of accuracy, especially when dealing with colonies, foundations, and kinship relations.[47] It is likely that Polybius' irritation and jealousy were prompted at least in part by awareness that Timaeus was widely read and admired by the Romans; but more than one scholar has argued that this passage was specifically aimed at Cato, whom Polybius obviously could not name directly.[48]

It has frequently been suggested that Cato was inspired by Greek works devoted to foundations, and that his title, *Origines*, was meant to be a translation of the Greek *Ktiseis*. It is true that one of our Greek sources designated Cato's *Origines* in exactly this way (F75), and although *origo* is not a very close translation of *ktisis* ('foundation'),[49] it must be acknowledged that there is no precise Latin equivalent.[50] But even if that is the explanation of Cato's title, it does not take us very far, because Hellenistic foundation literature (that is, specialist works entitled κτίσεις) comprised poetry, antiquarianism, and romantic fiction,[51] but not history. This literature is clearly distinct from accounts of foundations incorporated in the works of historians, which is what Polybius is talking about in his digressions on historical method.[52]

There is no denying that some fragments of Cato's *Origines* refer to Greek heroes or imply a Greek or partly Greek origin for Italian cities or peoples.[53] To that extent they subscribe to the Hellenocentric picture of early Italian history and may indicate the direct use of Greek sources.[54] But this is not the only possible explanation, because

[46] L. Pearson, *YCS* 24 (1975), 171–95; id., *The Greek Historians of the West* (Atlanta, Ga., 1987), following J. Geffcken, *Timaios' Geographie des Westens* (Berlin, 1892).

[47] 12.26d.2: περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας καὶ κτίσεις καὶ συγγενείας.

[48] R. Laqueur, *RE* 6A (1936), 1203; De Sanctis, *SR* 4.2. 1, 62; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 247 n. 7.

[49] On the meaning of κτίσις see I. 172–3 and nn. 60–1.

[50] This is one of those cases where instead of using an abstract noun for an event or process Latin prefers a participial phrase—what is sometimes called the *occisus Caesar* construction; cf. Briscoe, *Comm.* 4, index s.v. 'participial construction'. Thus, 'the foundation of the city', in Latin, is *urbs condita*, as in the title of Livy's work *Ab urbe condita*.

[51] Key figures include the poets Callimachus and Apollonius, and the antiquarians Dionysius of Chalcis and Polemon of Ilion. On earlier *ktisis*-poetry see C. Dougherty, *JHS* 114 (1994), 35–46. On foundation literature in general, B. Schmid, *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen* (Diss. Freiburg in der Schweiz, 1947).

[52] Timpe (*AAP* 83 (1970–1), 16) misunderstands this when suggesting that Polybius was attacking the genre of foundation literature; and in n. 44 he wrongly implies that Polybius was contrasting the study of genealogies, colonies, foundations, etc. with historiography as such.

[53] Relevant fragments include nos. 45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58, 61, 63, 64, 65, 70, 74.

[54] As assumed by Moretti, *RFIC* 80 (1982), 289; Timpe, *AAP* 83 (1970–1), 19–20.

in many cases Hellenized versions appear to have been accepted by the peoples themselves and absorbed into local tradition. The best example of this process of assimilation is the Roman foundation legend, which had incorporated the story of Aeneas and the Trojans, as well as those of Hercules and probably Evander, long before the first Roman historians began to write.[55] Obviously Cato's account of the Aeneas legend (F4–12) is not based primarily on Greek sources but on a well-developed native tradition. In the same way, when he spoke of Falerii as an Argive settlement (F53) he was probably following local tradition rather than the version of Timaeus or some other Greek author (see comm. ad loc.), although in this instance and elsewhere we should not rule out the possibility that he had read widely and was synthesizing information from a variety of sources (see comm. on F70).

It is not at all certain what significance should be attached to the presence of Greek elements in Cato's account of Italian origins. In a series of important studies, Cesare Letta has confronted the problem of how these 'Hellenizing' passages are to be reconciled with Cato's supposed hostility to all things Greek (on which see I. 194–5).[56] In his initial study Letta presented a carefully nuanced picture of Cato's attitude to the Greeks which we broadly share. Cato's purpose was to keep Hellenic culture in its place, and to invite his fellow citizens to make pragmatic use of it as appropriate but to free themselves from its clutches; they should stop trying to identify themselves in relation to the Greek world or turning their backs on their own national culture, the *mos maiorum*.[57] Letta argues that in the *Origines* Cato made a systematic effort to reduce or marginalize the contribution of Greek immigrants to the formation of the peoples of Italy. Taking each of the relevant fragments one by one, he suggests that in some cases Cato ignored Hellenizing legends,[58] in others he acknowledged them but denied their historical validity,[59] and in yet others he minimized the role of the Greeks either by suggesting that they had no lasting cultural effect or by giving greater prominence to non-Greek elements.[60]

In Letta's view, Cato's aim was to show that the moral character of the Romans and their central Italian neighbours was a native product that owed little or nothing to Greek influences.

[55] See Fabius Pictor (1) F1–3 (Aeneas); F7 (Hercules); F27 (Evander); cf. Cincius (2) F6–7, 9–10 (with comm. ad locc.). On the history of the Aeneas legend and its absorption into the Roman native tradition see Cornell, *PCPhS* 21 (1975), 1–32.

[56] Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 3–30, 416–39; and in Urso (ed.), *Patria diversis gentibus una?* (2008), 171–95.

[57] Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 22: 'Non è una rozza o ipocrita esortazione ad uno studio all'acqua di rose, ma un invito a sfruttare senza cedimenti la cultura greca ai propri scopi, per emanciparsi dalla soggezione al mondo greco, senza identificarsi in essa e senza rinunciare alla cultura nazionale, al *mos maiorum*.'

[58] Thus he favoured the local tradition that attributed the foundation of Praeneste to Caeculus the son of Vulcan (F67), rather than an alternative Greek version (Solin. 2.9); similarly he made Nola an Etruscan rather than a Chalcidian foundation (F52: for the Chalcidian version see Just. 20.1.13; Sil. *Pun.* 12.161). Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 430 n. 236; in Urso (ed.), *Patria diuersis gentibus una?* (2008), 190; but see comm. ad locc. for notes of caution.

[59] In the case of the Sabines (F50–1); but see comm. ad loc. for details.

[60] No lasting cultural effect: Letta in Urso (ed.), *Patribus diuersis gentibus una?* (2008), 183–4 and 185–6, on Falerii (F53) and Petelia (F65), respectively; greater prominence to non-Greek elements: ibid. 177–83 on Pisa (F70), and see next note.

The case is well argued and persuasive up to a point; but not all the arguments are equally strong, and in some cases they amount to special pleading. Letta almost certainly goes too far in attributing to Cato a prejudiced and doctrinaire approach to the question of Italian origins; it is more probable that Cato was willing to record the presence of Greek elements in the development of early Italy when the evidence seemed to warrant it. On the other hand, there is no sign that he gave any special prominence to Hellenizing versions, and it is obviously unthinkable that he would have accepted any idea of Greek superiority over indigenous Italians or of the latter becoming civilized as a result of contact with Greek immigrants. It is even possible that on at least one occasion he turned the usual relationship between Greeks and barbarians on its head. There is a good chance that he described the Aborigines, the first inhabitants of Italy, not only as of Greek origin (F49), but also as primitive and uncivilized nomads (see comm. on F63). It was only after they were merged with the more civilized Trojans under Aeneas that the Latin nation was formed. Moreover, at Cutiliae and Reate they were defeated and replaced by invading Sabines from the region around Amiternum (F50).[61]

To sum up, our view of this matter is close to Letta's, but can be expressed somewhat differently. Cato's account of early Italy did not ignore the Greeks, or seek to exclude them; but he put them firmly in their place. He acknowledged that they played some part in the story, but he did not put them at the centre of the stage. Unlike the Greek historians and their Hellenizing Roman imitators, Cato did not assume that Greek myths provided a complete historical record of early times, and did not shape his account of Italian origins solely as a historicized version of the wanderings of Greek heroes. The fragments make it clear that he gave a pragmatic report of what he had been able to discover by first-hand research in the communities of Italy. The retailing of historicized myths in writers such as Diodorus or Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which no doubt also reflects the character of their sources, including Timaeus, contrasts sharply with Cato's factual reports of what he had heard and seen for himself.

It remains to ask what Cato was aiming to achieve by devoting such a large proportion of his historical work to the peoples of Italy. That he saw Italy as in some sense a cultural unit, despite its ethnic and linguistic diversity, is possible, especially in view of Servius' comment (T11e) that he praised the *disciplina et uita* of Italy (the comment is prompted by the passage in the *Aeneid* where Numanus Remulus, the brother-in-law of Turnus, taunts the beleaguered Trojans with the assertion that in Italy they are faced with a tough enemy, a different proposition from the Greeks they had faced at Troy: 9.601–20).[62] The possibility that Cato saw toughness as in some sense characteristic of the Italian peoples in general is strengthened by F41, which implies that most if not all of the peoples in the *Origines* were *boni et strenui*.[63] In Letta's view

[61] Letta is right to draw attention to these features of Cato's account, which undoubtedly minimize the contribution of the (originally Greek) Aborigines to the ethnic formation of the Latins and Sabines. *Contra*: Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 60 n. 62.

[62] On this passage see M. E. Taylor, *AJPh* 76 (1955), 216–78, at 272 ff. She is inclined to stress the contrast between primitive toughness and civilized weakness, rather than between Italians and outsiders; but both dichotomies are present in Virgil. *Disciplina* in Servius means 'upbringing' (cf. F51), and *uita* 'way of life', as in Varro's *de uita p.R.*

[63] Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 417. On the combination *boni et strenui* see comm. on F41.

Cato was expressing a political and moral conception of Italy as a national unit, but one that was limited to the peoples of central and southern Italy who were linked to Rome, and to one another, by ethnic and linguistic ties: that is to say, the Umbrian and Sabellian peoples who all claimed descent, directly or indirectly, from the Sabines; for Letta the Sabines are the key unifying element of this 'Italia dei *mores Romani*'.[64] This restricted definition of Italy would have excluded not only the Greek cities, but also the Etruscans and the Celts, Ligurians, and other peoples of the North. But there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Cato made any such distinction between a broad conception of Italy as a geographical or strategic unit and a narrower politically and morally defined Italian 'nation'. Any interpretation of Cato's ideological purpose, if he had one, must take account of the fact that Nepos speaks of every Italian community (*quaeque ciuitas Italica*), and that the relevant books of the *Origines* included Greeks, Etruscans, Celts, Ligurians, Venetians, and the rest.[65]

The fact that he chose to include all the peoples of Italy in his work must mean that Cato had some concept of Italy as a historical unit. What united it in Cato's time was obviously the fact that all of it, right up to the Alps, was now subject to the Romans, a fact which meant that the history of every one of its communities was now inextricably and permanently linked with that of Rome. The Romans had long since acquired the habit of treating Italy as their own back-yard, the most telling evidence being their suppression of the Bacchanalia in 186 BC.[66] It would also have been obvious to anyone in the second century that Rome's military success depended on the support of the Italian allies—a point made explicitly by Polybius (2.24.1 and ff.). It would not be altogether surprising if Cato had formed a view of Italy that was united by the toughness and warlike spirit of its various component peoples, however much they might have differed from one another in race, language, institutions, and moral character. Indeed he may have seen this diversity as a source of strength.[67]

But the most telling point is that the inclusion of Italy in a Roman history served to demonstrate more clearly than anything else the effect of the Roman conquest and the basis of Roman power. The one thing that unites all the peoples dealt with in books 2–3, whether or not they formed part of 'Italy' as geographically defined, is that they were all now subject to the Romans. Naturally Cato covered Cisalpine Gaul and Liguria, which had only recently been conquered and with considerable effort; the campaigns, and the administrative reorganization that followed, had involved him personally.[68] His survey of the region, of the origins of its peoples, and of the changes

[64] Letta, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 416–24; id, in Urso (ed.), *Patria diuersis gentibus una?* (2008), 171–3.

[65] The clear implication is also that Cato included the northern peoples within 'Italy', which remains probable. But it is possible that he drew the geographical boundary at the Apennines (see comm. on F48 and F150), in which case we should have to conclude that book 2 extended beyond Italy proper, and that Nepos' summary of books 2–3 is not strictly accurate (but in view of his description of books 4–5 that is hardly a problem).

[66] On which see A. H. McDonald, *JRS* 34 (1944), 11–33. It has been suggested that the suppression of the cult 'throughout Italy' (e.g. Liv. 39.18.7–8: *per totam Italiam*) actually refers only to the *ager Romanus*: thus H. Galsterer, *Herrschaft und Verwaltung im republikanischen Italien* (Munich, 1976), 37–41; H. Mouritsen, *Italian Unification* (London, 1998), 49–58; but see Briscoe, *Comm.* 3. 244–7.

[67] Just as he thought that the Roman constitution was superior to others because it was the collective product of many generations, rather than the creation of one man (see F131).

[68] Williams, *Beyond the Rubicon* (2001), 57, and see commentary on F56.

that had taken place in his lifetime clearly indicated the scale of Rome's achievement and the extent of its power. It is arguable, therefore, that Cato's purpose in writing about the peoples of Italy in the *Origines* was to explain the single most important political fact in the history of the Mediterranean world in his time, namely the concentration of military power in the hands of Rome at the head of an alliance of Italian communities and states. This interpretation receives some support from the possibility, mentioned at I. 203, that the later books gave an account of the further growth of the Roman empire, and included a survey of the peoples and places now incorporated in Rome's overseas dominions. These later books are dealt with in the next section.

The *Origines*: form, content, and character of individual sections. (b) Books 4–7

We have already seen (I. 201–5) that the evidence is insufficient to permit a definite answer to the question of how the later books were organized, and there is not much more to tell us what they might have contained. Nevertheless there are some things that can be said with reasonable certainty about the later books of Cato's *Origines*. In the first place they undoubtedly contained military narrative. This is clear not only from Nepos' statement (T1) that the later books dealt with wars (*bella*), but from a number of preserved fragments that are evidently taken from descriptions of campaigns and battles. These include not only well-known fragments such as the account of the military tribune in the First Punic War who sacrificed himself to save a beleaguered Roman army (F76; other well-known campaign fragments include F78–9 and F115), but also little-known and rarely quoted fragments that are preserved without any historical context (e.g. F82, 83, 95, 96, 97): of these the only thing that can be said is that they are taken from military narratives of some kind. That the later books of the *Origines* were concerned with wars and campaigns is beyond doubt; the other category of material that was certainly included is represented by fragments dealing with the geography, ethnography, and institutions of the regions in which the wars were fought (see I. 204–5). A combination of ethnography and military narrative, which would have many parallels in ancient historiography, can be regarded as certain in the later books of the *Origines*.

A second feature of Cato's account that we can be sure of, strange though it may seem, is that he did not refer to military commanders by name. This peculiarity is mentioned by two independent authorities, Nepos (T1) and the elder Pliny (T20), and is confirmed by the fragments, where Cato refers to Roman commanders by their official titles (*consul*, *tribunus militum*, etc.); he does the same for non-Romans too, speaking of the Carthaginian *imperator* in one fragment (F76), and even Hannibal is referred to simply as 'the dictator of the Carthaginians' (*dictator Carthaginiensium*: F78). The third feature that remains beyond doubt is that Cato inserted some of his own speeches into his narrative. This too was unique in Roman historiography, as far as we know.[69] Two such speeches are known: the speech on behalf of the Rhodians, delivered in 167 BC (T12; F87–93), and that against Galba, at the end of Cato's life

[69] The model may have been Xenophon's *Anabasis*, as suggested by Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 194 and n. 90, who also thinks it likely that the Alexander historians included their own speeches.

(T13; F104–7). Whether he included others, and if so which ones, is entirely uncertain.

These three distinctive features of the later books of Cato's *Origines* go some way to help us define the character of the narrative, but they also raise further questions in their turn. We have seen that Cato included military narrative and ethno-geographical material. What is much less certain is whether he covered internal political history. It has to be said that there is little sign of it in the fragments, and it may be that Cato dealt mainly with wars and foreign affairs and paid little attention to domestic events. But the two speeches, *For the Rhodians* and *Against Galba*, even though they were occasioned by events overseas, were delivered in Rome, the former in a senatorial debate and the latter before the people in support of a tribunician proposal, and therefore belong to political history. A number of other fragments appear to deal with items of dress (F108–9, 119, 137, 145), and may be taken from an episode in which such matters had become politically contentious, most obviously in a debate over sumptuary legislation. This was a matter of abiding interest to Cato, and there is obviously a chance that it was treated in the *Origines*, perhaps in another of his speeches which he incorporated in his text.[70] One suggestion that has been made is that Cato included an account of ancient Roman customs, perhaps contrasted with the decadence of his own day. This may have occurred in book 7, to which two of the fragments in question are assigned (F108–9); the others are unassigned, but are included by editors in book 7 on the assumption that they belong to an extensive and wide-ranging digression dealing with such matters as dining habits (F144), including singing at banquets (F113), women's hairstyles (F119) and clothing (F109, 145), the dress of consular candidates (F137), and the shoes worn by senators and magistrates (F108). While this speculation has its attractions, not least the fact that it would help to explain the expanded scale of the later books, it is not supported by any direct evidence and represents only a theoretical possibility. The individual fragments could each be assigned to any number of possible contexts, and there is no reason to assume that they belong together, or even that they are taken from the same book. Once again we have to admit that the evidence is inadequate to identify the context of many individual fragments or to reconstruct the general content of whole passages in the later books.

Another question to which no certain answer can be given is whether, and if so how fully, Cato narrated his own activities as a magistrate and commander in the *Origines*. Although both Livy and Plutarch acknowledge their debt to Cato's own version of events in their accounts of the Spanish campaign in 195–194 (F133, 135) and of the battle of Thermopylae in 191 (F136), neither specifically identifies the *Origines* as the source, and other possibilities are available.[71] On general grounds, however, we think it extremely probable that Cato did narrate these events in the *Origines*, and that it was in this work that Livy at least is likely to have found his information (with

[70] But probably not the speech delivered during the debate on the *lex Oppia*: Livy would not have composed a fictitious speech for Cato at 34.2–4 if Cato's actual speech had been available for everyone to read in the *Origines*. See Briscoe, *Comm.* 2. 39–40; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 70 and n. 118, and cf. the references cited in n. 12.

[71] Most obviously speeches in which Cato defended his own record. For discussion of this issue see the commentary on F133, 135, and 136.

Plutarch this conclusion is less certain);[72] this conclusion is supported by the general observation that Cato was not known for reticence about his own achievements, and by the particular fact that he included his own speeches.

At this point we need to ask how Cato's account of his own activities can be reconciled with the absence of individual names. Is it conceivable that Cato referred to himself anonymously? The inclusion of his own speeches implies that at least parts of the narrative had a personal character; he must somehow have identified himself as the speaker on these occasions, and Galba too must have been mentioned by name. It may be that the omission of names did not apply to accounts of domestic events. But even in the military sphere (and we should acknowledge that strictly speaking Nepos and Pliny refer only to names of military commanders) it is hard to imagine that Cato could have written a narrative of Rome's wars, and particularly of his own campaigns, without any names at all—although by adopting the first person he could have made an exception in his own case, and thus contrived to identify himself but not anyone else.

It is difficult to determine whether Cato referred to himself in the first person. The fragments certainly include first person statements, but some of these could be taken from speeches, or indeed from dialogue;[73] even when they seem to belong to narrative passages, instances of the first person plural could be references to the Romans in general—in accordance with a well-known Roman convention.[74] However this issue is to be resolved, the virtual impossibility of a history without personal names makes it unlikely that Cato identified no one other than himself in the later books of the *Origines*. Although the details must remain conjectural, the likeliest explanation is that he did in fact identify the major figures in the story when they first appeared on the stage—for example when they were appointed to positions of command (perhaps he listed the chief magistrates and their allocated provinces at the start of each year)—but then during the narrative of the actual campaigns referred to them by their title rather than by name. This would be compatible with the evidence we have, and makes rational sense in contrast to the alternative, that in the later books Cato never identified any individual by name; in that case, much of the history would have been impossibly cryptic, not to say incomprehensible.[75] By removing personal names from the detailed narrative of campaigns and battles Cato's purpose was not to keep readers in the dark about who the individual commanders actually were (!), but to make an ideological point. That is to say, his aim was to emphasise a concept of public duty—the idea that men exercised command by virtue of their office, and that they won victories and achieved fame as servants of the people.[76] Cato also firmly believed that

[72] See Cornell in Smith and Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (2009), 15–40, on which much of the present discussion is based.

[73] e.g. F102–3. Examples of dialogue occur in F42 and F78–9.

[74] The convention is discussed in Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 287–8. For examples in Cato's *Origines* see F20, 82, 114a, 119. For the possible use of the first person plural in F95, reading *pugnauimus*, see comm. ad loc.

[75] Notice, incidentally, that personal names appear frequently in the fragments of books 1–3 (e.g. F4–11, 15–16, 25, 36, 45, 50–1, 61, 63–5, 67, 69, 70, 74). Cf. Astin, *Cato*, 233.

[76] Thus, rightly, G. Misch, *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity* (London, 1950), 1, 214; Astin, *Cato*, 232–3. We may compare the British tradition of observing a distinction between individuals and the offices they hold. Parliamentarians refer to each other not by name but as 'the honourable (or right honourable) member for X', and in cabinet used to address one another as 'Prime Minister' or 'Secretary of State'.

campaigns were conducted, and victories won, as much by the ordinary soldiers as by their commanders. The *populus Romanus* was the hero of the *Origines*, as indeed Cato may have emphasized in the opening sentence of the work (F1). This idea receives confirmation from two passages of Cicero, printed here as different versions of F114. Cicero must be referring to a passage of the *Origines* in which Cato alluded to, and perhaps sought to explain, his own practice of not naming commanders (see comm. on F114).

We have suggested that Cato may have listed the chief magistrates and the allocation of provinces at the start of each year. If so, that would imply that the arrangement of the later books was annalistic. It has been argued that F80, in which Cato mocks the annual records of the Pontifex Maximus, rules out such an arrangement, but it plainly does nothing of the kind (see comm. ad loc.). On the other hand, a strictly year-by-year narrative in the manner of Livy seems unlikely for Cato's account of the whole period from 264 to 149. For one thing, Nepos states (T1) that Cato narrated the wars in the later books *capitulatim*, that is, 'summarily' or 'in broad outline' (thus our translation), and is likely to have passed over years in which little of note occurred; the word is the exact equivalent of Greek κεφαλαιωδῶς, which is how Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus are said by Dionysius (1.6.2) to have covered the period before their own age, and how Polybius summarised the period from 264 to 220 before the start of his detailed annalistic narrative (1.13.7 etc. See introduction to Fabius, I. 170 and n. 48). A strictly annalistic structure would also be ruled out if Cato organized the later books in geographical sections or according to theatres of war (see above). But whatever he did, it remains possible that he dated events by naming the annual consuls, and began his account of each major campaign by naming the magistrates whose actions he was going to narrate in greater detail.

One final comment is required on Nepos' statement (T1) that Cato included 'wonders' (*admiranda*) in his account of Italy and Spain.[77] The sensational reporting of marvels was a feature of Hellenistic historiography, and was one of the things that Polybius criticized in Timaeus (12.24.5: he describes Timaeus' fondness for this kind of thing as 'womanish'—evidently a real insult). Works devoted exclusively to wonders were also produced. An example of this Hellenistic genre of paradoxography (as it was called) is the pseudo-Aristotelian work *De mirabilibus auscultationibus* ('On Wonderful Things Heard'), which is widely believed to have drawn upon Timaeus.[78] This work contains a mixture of natural wonders, tall stories, and far-fetched travellers' tales, drawn from a variety of sources. The natural wonders recorded by Cato are similar—and indeed one of the fragments is quoted in a paradoxographical text (F76); relevant fragments report goats of phenomenal agility, pigs too fat to walk, rivers teeming with fish, fearsomely powerful winds, and unlimited mountains of salt (F47, 48, 99, 111, 116). But these seem to be the product

[77] It is not certain what is meant by Nepos' statement that the *Origines* described *quae . . . aut fierent aut uiderentur admiranda*. This may simply mean 'wonderful things that happened or were seen' (hence our translation: 'events or sights'); but it is possible that *uiderentur* expresses a certain scepticism, or at least suspension of judgement, and that the phrase actually means something like 'real or alleged wonders'.

[78] J. Geffcken, *Timaios' Geographie des Westens* (Berlin, 1892), 90–3; on the pseudo-Aristotelian *mir. ausc.* see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972), 771–2 (also fundamental on paradoxography in general); G. Vanotti, *Aristotele: racconti meravigliosi* (Milan, 2007).

of autopsy and diligent personal inquiry, not of secondary reading. That at any rate is the implication of Nepos' statement *in quibus multa industria et diligentia comparet, nulla doctrina* (T1), taking *in quibus* to refer to Cato's record of *admiranda* in the previous sentence, rather than to the *Origines* in general.[79] If so *nulla doctrina* would suggest that Cato cited no literary sources and offered no philosophical discussion of wonders, which is indeed what one would expect. There is a problem, however, in the fact that the logic of Nepos' sentence would seem to require a continuation of positive features rather than the jarring negative of the final two words; in the view of A. S. Gratwick, *nulla doctrina* is 'beyond reasonable defence'.[80] Earlier editors suggested repetition of *multa* instead of *nulla*; but Nipperdey reverted to the transmitted reading, which has been adopted without question by all modern editions. Gratwick however proposed <*non*>*nulla doctrina*, but in that case we should have to take *in quibus* to refer to the work as a whole, and Nepos' comment to imply that Cato did, in fact, provide evidence of wide reading.

The arrangement of the fragments

For reasons that have been explained, the arrangement of the fragments presents special difficulties in the case of Cato's *Origines*. Our policy has been to adhere strictly to the principles set out in the General Introduction, and in the books that can be deemed to have had a narrative structure (that is, book 1 and each of books 4–7) 'fragments which can be assigned both to a numbered book and to a chronological sequence are arranged within the book in that sequence'. Fragments which cannot be ordered chronologically are printed after the appropriate chronological sequence and grouped by citing sources (listed chronologically by certain or probable date of publication) and in order of citation within each source. This citation order (as it may be called) is also applied to all numbered fragments of books 2 (F27–40) and 3 (F41–5), in the absence of any clear evidence for how these books were, in fact, organized. The following section (F46–75) includes fragments dealing with Italy but without book attribution, listed in citation order.[81] Most of the fragments in this section can be assumed to come from book 2 or book 3. Some, however, may belong to book 1—depending on where Cato began his general account of Italy, and whether or not book 1 also included the origins of places such as Alba and Lavinium, and peoples such as the Latins and Aborigines (see I. 206). Wherever there is a possibility that a fragment belongs in book 1, this will be noted at the start of the commentary on the fragment. Otherwise it should be assumed that we regard the fragment as belonging probably to book 2 or book 3.

Fragments cited from books 4–7 are placed within each book in chronological order of events referred to when these can be identified, followed by remaining fragments in citation order. The next section (F113–28) contains fragments of the *Origines* that are cited without book numbers and cannot be placed in context. The fragments in this section are arranged in citation order, as are those of the final section ('Possible

[79] Thus Astin, *Cato*, 223; but others take *in quibus* to mean *in libris Originum*: see n. 6.

[80] *CHCL* 2.1. 150 n. 2.

[81] Citation order is strictly followed, with the exception of F51, which clearly belongs together with F50.

Fragments', F129–56). We have included under this heading a selection of the many fragments that are attributed to Cato but without any indication of the work from which they are taken. The selection is determined by the content, and includes all fragments that could, with some degree of plausibility, be ascribed to a historical work. Readers should therefore be aware that fragments in this section are not securely attested as fragments of the *Origines*, and that their connection with this work is at best probable and in some cases only conjectural. The case for each fragment is considered in more detail in the commentary.

Peter appended to his edition a similar category of *incertorum Catonis librorum reliquiae selectae* ('selected fragments of uncertain works of Cato'), but his selection was both more and less strict than ours. He excluded even from the 'uncertain' category our F129, 131, 139, 141, 151, and 156, but on the other hand he included as certain fragments of the *Origines* our F133 (=92P), 137 (=112P), 144 (=119P), 145 (=115P), 146 (=89P), 148 (=80P) and 150 (=85P). Chassignet and Beck–Walter also include all of these among the certain fragments, but ignore the rest of the possible fragments. Jordan and the Cugusis, as editors of the complete works of Cato, have the luxury of being able to include all the unassigned Cato fragments under the heading *incertorum librorum fragmenta/reliquiae*, but both appear to have listed the possibly historical fragments first.

(TJC)

6

L. Cassius Hemina

Editions: Peter 1[2]. clxv–clxxiii, 98–111; C. Santini, *I frammenti di L. Cassio Emina* (Pisa, 1995) (cited as 'Santini'); Chassignet 2. ix–xvi, 2–16, 91–113; Beck–Walter 1. 242–81.

Principal discussions: I. E. Schmitter, *Cassii Heminae annalium fragmenta emendata disposita illustrata* (Düsseldorf 1861); F. Cauer, 'Die römische Aeneassage von Naevius bis Vergilius', *JbKPh*, Suppbd. 15 (1887), 97–182, at 109–14; C. Cichorius, 'Cassius (47)', *RE* 3 (1899), 1723–5; J. Martha, 'L'Histoire à Rome. Les successeurs de Caton. Cassius Hemina', *RCC* 11 (1902–3), 2.108–13; Leo, *GRL* (1913), 329–30; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 127–8; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 194–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 73–7; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1 (1966), 106–14; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 211–13; A. J. Kleywegt, *Varro über die Penaten und die 'grossen Götter'*, *MAWBL*, n.r. 35.7 (1972); E. Rawson, 'The first Latin annalists', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 690–702 (=*Roman Culture* (1991), 246–57); W. Suerbaum, 'Die Suche nach der *antiqua mater* in der vorvergilischen Annalistik. Die Irrfahrten des Aeneas bei Cassius Hemina', *Beiträge zu altitalischen Geistesgeschichte*, ed. R. Altheim-Stiehl and M. Rosenbach (Münster, 1986), 269–97; U. W. Scholz, 'Zu L. Cassius Hemina', *Hermes* 117 (1989), 167–81; G. Forsythe, 'Some notes on the *History* of Cassius Hemina', *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 326–44; C. Santini, 'Hemina', *GIF* 46 (1994), 183–8; M. Chassignet, 'Étiologie, étymologie et éponymie chez Cassius Hemina: mécanismes et fonction', *LEC* 66 (1998), 321–35; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 418–21; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 25–6.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Virtually nothing is known of the life of L. Cassius Hemina.[1] A military tribune of 252 apart, C. Cassius Longinus, controversial both as consul in 171 and censor in 154, was the first Cassius known to have held any office since the infamous Sp. Cassius of the early republic (the next was C. Cassius Longinus, jointly responsible, as tribune in 137, for carrying the law extending secret voting to trials, and consul in 127). It is, however, quite uncertain whether the historian was related to these men, and therefore illegitimate to argue[2] that Hemina was opposed to the traditionalism of Cato because (i) he referred, in a censorial context, to the demolition of statues on the Capitol (F43), and P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum (cos. 162), as censor in 158, destroyed all statues not authorized by senate and people, including that of Sp. Cassius (Piso 9 F40), (ii) the same Nasica was responsible for a *senatus consultum* ordering the destruction of the permanent theatre being built by Cassius and his

[1] The *praenomen* is attested only in F6 (if our argument on that fragment is accepted) and 26.

[2] Thus Santini 8, 24–7. For apparently deliberate imitation of Cato by Hemina see commentary on F30 and 41.

censorial colleague in 154.[3] (iii) a C. Cassius prosecuted Cato.[4] F41 suggests strong sympathy for those deprived of *agri publicus* by the powerful, but may belong to a speech. We know of no office held by Hemina, and Rawson's statement[5] that he 'had a cursus of some sort' depends on her mistaken interpretation of F29.[6] As to the *cognomen*, unique in Roman nomenclature, it has normally been taken as the Latin word, derived from the Greek Ἡμίνα,[7] meaning a measure equivalent to just over a quarter of a litre.[8] The reason for the adoption of the *cognomen* is obscure: short stature[9] is plausible, frugality[10] less so. Santini,[11] however, argues that the *cognomen* indicates Etruscan origin, derived from the name *He(i)mni* found in Etruscan inscriptions, and sees this as another indication of a hostile attitude towards Cato.[12] It is indeed the case that Etruscan names can end in *-ina* as well as a consonant followed by *-na*, but there is no case of a name ending in *-ina* being formed by the insertion of *-i-* between a consonant and *-n-*.[13]

There are three pieces of evidence for Hemina's date: (i) F40, where Censorinus says that Hemina was alive in 146,[14] the date he gave for the fourth celebration of the *ludi saeculares*; (ii) T2 and T4, where the elder Pliny describes Hemina as *ex antiquissimis* and *uetustissimus auctor annalium* respectively, epithets which he applies to no other second-century writer; (iii) F32, where Priscian says that the *titulus* of book 4 read *bellum Punicum posterior* (he cites it as an example of a neuter ending in *-ior*). From (iii) the obvious and almost universally accepted conclusion—*posterior* denoting the second in a series of two—is that when Hemina 'published' book 4, the Third Punic War had not yet begun, or at least that he started the book before it began, and that the now anachronistic *posterior* was not subsequently altered.[15] In any case, Hemina will have completed a substantial part of his work before 149.

That conclusion was challenged by Forsythe,[16] who was worried by the supposition that Cato, still writing his *Origines* in 149, influenced[17] someone who had completed a large part of his work by that date. He claimed that *posterior* does not necessarily indicate the second in a series of two, but, like *alter* and *posterus*, can mean 'next' in a series of more than two,[18] and that in any case the words might not have been written

[3] See sources at *MRR* 1. 449. [4] *orat.* F176 Malc. = F171 Cugusi (cf. I. 191 n. 1).

[5] *Roman Culture*, 255. [6] Cf. comm. ad loc.

[7] It is uncertain whether the accent is paroxytone or properispomenon; see LSJ s.v. The first two vowels are long, but it is difficult for historians to change their ingrained habits. Omission of the aspirate in manuscripts is not noted in the apparatus.

[8] Cf. Viedebannt, *RE* 8. 248.

[9] This, presumably, is what Schmitter (*Cassii Heminae annalium fragmenta*, 10) meant by *corporis . . . uitio* (the words omitted are *siue ingenii*, a less happy suggestion). In English a short person is sometimes referred to as 'pint size'.

[10] Martha, *RCC* 11 (1902), 108–9. [11] pp. 28–9, and in *GIF* 46 (1994), 183–8.

[12] p. 8 (the assumption is that there was antipathy towards Rome in mid-second century Etruria; we find this unconvincing).

[13] Cf. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904), 62–107.

[14] The emphasis is on Hemina; Sigonius needlessly wanted to change *uiuebat* to *uiuebant*, since Piso and Gellius were also alive in 146 (A. Baudou, *RPh* 69 (1995), 33 n. 75, strangely thought the singular referred to all three writers).

[15] Cf. Santini, 36. [16] *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 327–9.

[17] Cf. n. 2. Forsythe also pointed to the similarity of F4–5 to the subject matter of much of books 2 and 3 of Cato.

[18] Santini (15) wrongly ascribes to Forsythe the statement that *posterior* is often used as a synonym of *alius* 'in describing a series of more than two items': Forsythe is there talking about *alter*.

by Hemina himself, but have been part of a 'table of contents' compiled by a later scribe.[19] On this basis, Forsythe argued that while Hemina was certainly earlier than Piso, he was not all that much earlier, and could have been writing in the 130s or even 120s; he was thus enabled to interpret F41 as referring to the time of Tiberius Gracchus.[20]

The whole argument is mistaken: the fact is that there is no example of *posterior* being used to refer to the second in a series of more than two—see *TLL* 10.2.206.59 ff. The fact that *alter* and *posterus* are so used is irrelevant. Neither Hemina nor a scribe could have used it thus.

As to what *titulus* means and where the words occurred, the best solution is perhaps that Hemina began book 4 with these words, indicating that the account of the Hannibalic War was to follow; there is then no implication that the book contained nothing but that war, and no inconsistency with F34–5.[21] As far as the influence of Cato is concerned, there is no reason why the earlier books of Cato should not have been available to Hemina.

Work

Hemina's work is referred to as *annales* by the elder Pliny, Gellius, the Danieline version of Servius, Nonius on six occasions, and Priscian on five, as *historiae* by Nonius on five occasions, Diomedes, and Macrobius: the title must therefore be regarded as uncertain.

Fragments are attested from four books. Aeneas' escape from Troy (F6) and, probably, the period of the Alban kings (F9)[22] appeared in book 1, Romulus and Remus (F14) in book 2: it is thus likely that the first book went from the earliest legends up to, but not including, the foundation of the city. Of the fragments not attested as coming from the first book but clearly belonging there, F1–3 concern Saturn, Hercules, and Evander, F4–5 the foundation of Latin cities regarded as pre-dating Rome, F7 the origin of the Penates, and F8 Aeneas' arrival in Italy. F10–13 are attested as coming from book 1, but their context cannot be determined.

As well as F14, Mucius Scaevola's attempt to murder Porsenna (F20), and events of 389 (F23) and 280 (F24) are attested as coming from book 2; of the fragments not so attested, F15 (*interregnum* after the death of Romulus), F16–17 (Numa), F18 (Servius Tullius), F19 (Tarquinius Superbus), F21 (decemvirate), and F22 (Gallic occupation) fall inside the chronological limits of the attested fragments. F25–6 are attested as coming from book 2, but their context cannot be determined. The book thus covered a huge period of time.

[19] The logic of this, presumably, being that such a scribe did not himself understand the correct usage of *posterior*.

[20] See comm. ad loc.

[21] Cf. Leo, *GRL* 329 n.1; E. Täubler, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Dezemvirats und der Zwölftafeln* (Berlin, 1921), 135–8. See below.

[22] Denied by Forsythe, *Phoenix* 44 (1994), 341, who most implausibly thinks that Hemina treated Aeneas in book 2. It is true that *Siluis Albae regnantibus* is not part of the citation from Hemina (cf. commentary ad loc.), and it is possible that Hemina's discussion of the date of Homer and Hesiod occurred in an excursus.

As we have seen, F32 should be taken as indicating that book 4 began with the beginning of the Hannibalic War, and F27, dated to 219, can therefore be assigned to book 3; of the fragments attested as coming from book 3 (F28–31),[23] none can be securely dated. Scholz's view[24] that book 3 continued until the battle of Cannae is based on his unjustified belief that F28 and 30 refer to events of 217,[25] while Täubler's claim[26] that F32 was a reference to the contents of the previous book and that book 3 contained the whole of the Hannibalic War is unacceptable.

F35 indicates that book 4 continued to at least 181. Peter, though he printed *quarto* and had no textual note, stated in his introduction[27] that it and the following two fragments (F39–40)[28] came *ex libris qui post quartum erant* ('from the books which followed book 4'); Scholz[29] holds that the book number in F35 should be emended, arguing that Hemina wrote seven books in all, as did Cato and Piso; noting that seven was also the number of books into which the grammarian C. Octavius Lampadio divided Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, he claimed that seven was the accepted number of books for a historical work at this period. That is simply wilful; nevertheless, since Hemina referred to the year 146 and yet wrote *bellum Punicum posterior*,[30] the probability must be that he wrote a fifth book after the fourth had been published.[31] We have, therefore, given F39–40 the heading 'Book 4 or 5'. We have moved F41 from book 2, where it was placed by Peter, to 'Unplaced Fragments', where it joins F42. F43, said by Nonius to be *De censoribus libro ii*, becomes a 'Fragment of Uncertain Work'.

The earliest author to cite Hemina is the elder Pliny, but there are good reasons for thinking that Varro took material from him,[32] and F5 and 23 suggest that Verrius Flaccus also knew him.[33] Whether the neglect of Hemina was due either to his being overshadowed by Cato or to the work of Varro and Flaccus[34] is a matter of speculation.

Only one of the surviving fragments (F37) manifestly concerns military history (very tersely expressed) and three (F15, 20, 41) political history in the strict sense. The early myths apart, the rest deal with matters of social and cultural history, with particular emphasis on religion. That these matters played a significant part in Hemina's work can scarcely be doubted, but their predominance is due to the interests of the citing authors, and in particular, probably, to the material taken from Hemina by Varro and Verrius Flaccus.

Like Cato, Hemina was concerned with origins,[35] not just of cities (F4–5) but also of religious rites (F3, 7, 14, 16–17), the calendar (F18, 21, 23), the Roman view of suicide (F19), the arming of *proletarii* (F24), doctors at Rome (F27), names (F2, 4–5,

[23] For the possibility that the book number in F28 should be altered see commentary ad loc.

[24] *Hermes* 117 (1989), 169. He thus draws a parallel with Polybius and Cato, of whom the former let a book end with the battle of Cannae and the latter may have done so (cf. 1. 202). He might have added that Coelius Antipater split the aftermath of Cannae between two books: cf. 1. 259.

[25] See commentary ad locc. [26] loc. cit. (n. 21). [27] p. clxvi.

[28] He divided them from what precedes with a horizontal line.

[29] *Hermes* 117 (1989), 172. [30] See I. 220. [31] Cf. Santini, 16. [32] Cf. ibid. 38–9.

[33] Cf. ibid. 40, and our commentary ad locc.

[34] Cf. Santini 7 (though he talks of the antiquarians of the first century contributing to the loss of the original text).

[35] See in particular Chassignet *LEC* 66 (1998), 321–35.

14).[36] In a number of cases (F3, 16–18, 21, 24) the notion of the *πρῶτος εὑρέτης* ('first inventor')[37] is present.

Despite the influence of Cato,[38] however, Hemina was willing to differ from him on occasion, as in F8 and 14; in the latter he stands alone against all other accounts. Interest in Greek matters can been seen in F4–9 (the last, where Hemina gives a view on the date of Homer and Hesiod, is particularly striking) and 27.[39]

Hemina was clearly a believer in euhemerism, the doctrine, propounded by Euhemerus of Messene and introduced to Rome by Ennius, that the gods were originally human kings (see F1–3). Similar rationalism can be seen in Hemina's account of Numa's provisions concerning sacrifices (F16–17) and the explanation of the survival of the alleged books of Numa (F35). But while Hemina evidently did not doubt that the alleged tomb of Numa did contain Pythagorean writings (F35) and he may well have seen Numa's non-animal sacrifices (F16–17) as deriving from his supposed Pythagoreanism, neither those passages nor the philosophical commonplace of F25 suffice to show that Hemina himself was a Pythagorean.[40]

Origins and euhemerism apart, interest in religious matters can also be seen in F28, 32, and 34–5.

Hemina clearly dealt in some detail with episodes in Roman history which he regarded as important (cf. F24, 33, 35), but could also mention what might appear to be minor matters (F39). F15 must be direct speech and F25, 38, and 41 could be, but might equally be authorial remarks. F13 and 29 may be comments on other writers. Three fragments (F27, 35, 40) contain consular dates, and while it is unlikely that Hemina provided a narrative for every year of the republic, there is no reason to doubt that his work was arranged on an annalistic basis.[41]

(JB)

[36] But Santini (52) is misleading when, in addition to F2–4, he cites F7–8 as evidence for Hemina's 'sensibilità linguistica': *appellare* and *quae dicitur* are common in historical writers (e.g. Livy).

[37] Cf. Beck–Walter 350–1, to which add references to Nisbet and Hubbard's note on Horace *carm.* 1.3.12; M. Baumbach, *DNP* 10. 466–7. See further I. 254.

[38] See also I. 219 n. 2.

[39] Cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 249–50.

[40] Cf. Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1. 114; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 251.

[41] Implicitly denied by Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, ch. 2, who thinks that Piso was the first to write annalistically. C. W. Fornara, *History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1983), 25, regards Hemina as the first annalist. Against these views see now Northwood in N. Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdansk, 2007), 109–11.

7

C. Acilius

Editions: Peter HRR^2. cxxi–cxxiii, 49–52; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 813; Chassignet I. lxxxvi–viii, 62–5; Beck–Walter I. 232–41; G. S. Bucher, *BNJ* 813.

Principal discussions: L. Cantarelli, 'Gli annali greci di C. Acilio e Q. Quadrigario', *RFIC* 12 (1884), 1–23 (=*Studi romani e bizantini* (Rome, 1915), 17–36); E. Klebs, 'Acilius (4)', *RE* I (1893), 251–2; Schanz–Hosius I^4 (1927), 177–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* I (1952), 70–1; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 6–7; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt I (2002), 375–6.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Cicero knew of an Acilius who wrote a history in Greek (T1a). This Acilius must be the author of the *annales Aciliani* or *libri* in Greek to which Livy twice refers (T2, 3), but which he knew only through the mediation of a Claudius (very probably Quadrigarius) who used them for his Latin history (see F3, F4, and cf. comm. on F2). Dionysius of Halicarnassus (F6) and Plutarch (F1) give the *praenomen* of the historian as Gaius. If Acilius was indeed used by Quadrigarius, we have a fairly secure *terminus ante quem* (see introduction to Claudius Quadrigarius (no. 24)); while the latest securely datable fragment (F4) refers to 193 BC. So C. Acilius must have written his history in the second or early first century BC.

It has been suggested that the historian was a son or nephew of M'. Acilius Glabrio (cos. 191), but this can be no more than conjecture.[1] It is universally agreed, however, that he is to be identified with the senator C. Acilius who acted as interpreter for the three Greek philosophers in their appeal to the senate in 155 BC on behalf of the Athenians (T4).[2] This seems likely enough, given that no other senatorial C. Acilius is known and that the history was in Greek; but it nevertheless remains a conjecture, and the possibility of two senators of the same name cannot be ruled out.

The case would be greatly strengthened if the historian could be firmly dated to the mid-second century. Here much depends on T1b, which appears to give a publication date of between 143 and 141 BC. But there is a complication: the transmitted text reads *C. Iulius*, which Hertz emended to 'Acilius'. The conjecture has been generally

[1] M. Dondin-Payre, *Exercice du pouvoir et continuité gentilice: les Acilii Glabriones* (Rome, 1993), 285: 'fils cadet'. Cf. G. Forsythe in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic* (Rome, 2000), 2 n. 5; Beck–Walter 232: 'höchstwahrscheinlich ein Neffe'. Peter (cxxi–cxxii) is properly cautious; Chassignet (I. lxxxvi) rightly sceptical: omission of his *cognomen* suggests he was neither a Glabrio nor a Balbus.

[2] The Macrobius passage (T4c) undoubtedly derives from Gellius (with identical wording), but note that the MSS read *Caeho*, which demonstrates well the ease with which C. Acilius might be corrupted: cf. F5, 7–8.

accepted,[3] and is indeed probable given that the senator in question wrote in Greek and that the name Acilius was prone to corruption (above n. 2); the fact that the transmitted reading gives the most famous Roman name of all is also suspicious. We have therefore accepted Hertz's emendation and the identification of the historian with the C. Acilius of T4, but tentatively and in the knowledge that the resulting picture depends on a network of conjectures that should not be regarded as firmly established.[4]

Work

Cicero refers to Acilius' work as *historia* (T1a), Livy as *annales* (T2; cf. T3: *Graecos . . . libros*); but none of these references necessarily indicates the form or content of the work. We cannot know whether Acilius followed an annalistic framework, and a work in Greek cannot have had the formal title *Annales*.[5] Livy's citation in T3/F4 suggests the work was in more than one book, though neither he nor any of the other transmitting sources cites fragments with book numbers.

Characterizing Acilius' work is almost impossible from the meagre fragments. It certainly dealt with the regal period (F1), the Hannibalic War (F2, F3), events of the 190s (F4), and perhaps Acilius' own day (F6);[6] if F7 and F8 are correctly attributed to him, he dealt with the Evander legend and the arrival of Aeneas. Acilius' history is often characterized as philhellenic, though this seems to depend on identification of the historian with the senatorial interpreter of 155, or as a relative of M'. Acilius Glabrio (cos. 191), or both, rather than on anything conclusive in the fragments themselves.[7] It may be that he sought to explain and exemplify Rome's history, character, and achievements to a Greek audience: F7 and F1 deal with Roman ritual; F2 with the punishment of dishonesty by the censors; F6 with her buildings. But we can imagine that the aetiology in F1 and those that inform F5 and 7–8 (if rightly attributed) were of more interest to Romans than Greeks. While there is nothing strikingly philhellenic in the fragments, Acilius seems sympathetic to Greeks, with F4 and F7 showing interest in points of contact between Greek and Roman culture and myth. Some effort towards readability is evinced in anecdote (F2, F4) and vivid characterizations (F4). If the material in F3 was taken by Claudius from Acilius, it would reveal an interest in the supernatural and a tendency to exaggerate casualty

[3] But note that Jacoby (*FGrHist* 813 T2b) preferred 'C. Acilius', following Madvig.

[4] It is important to remember that our knowledge of second-century senatorial historians is far from complete; and no one has even asked why the *periochae* should have mentioned uniquely the publication of Acilius' history. It is theoretically possible that *C. Iulius* is the true reading, and that the very fact of a history by a C. Julius attracted the notice of Livy, and subsequently of epitomators. We should remember that it is an extremely unusual notice, and is the only publication date reported for any historian.

[5] Wiseman (*Clio's Cosmetics*, 12) suggests that histories of Rome in Greek were probably called Ῥωμαϊκά or Ῥωμαίων πράξεις, but without offering any specific title for Acilius. There was certainly no Greek equivalent of *annales*. See further Chassignet 1. xiv.

[6] Beck–Walter 233, following B. W. Frier, identify the 'Epochenjahr' of 146 as the likely end-point; so too Suerbaum, in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 375. This is possible but entirely speculative.

[7] e.g. Dondin-Peyre (cit. n. 1), 286, claiming that Acilius continued his father's philhellenism (in conflict with Cato) and, writing at least to 184, was responsible for elaborating his achievements in Greece. Writing in Greek may, by the middle of the second century, have signalled a cultural choice (Beck–Walter 59), one which would also find reflection in the wish to act as interpreter for the Athenian embassy.

figures (but see comm. ad loc.). Exaggeration may also be evident in F6. To what extent his approach to these matters set him apart from other historians is unclear.

Plutarch is the latest Greek author to cite Acilius, but he may not have done so at first hand. The only Latin author known to have taken more than a casual interest in his work is Claudius Quadrigarius, and even this may not have given rise to the full translation commonly assumed (see comm. on F3–4). Cicero and Livy cite him, but perhaps not directly; Cicero may have known him through Claudius Quadrigarius or some other intermediary (see comm. on F2), and Livy twice acknowledges that his citations are from Claudius (F3–4). He is likely to have been read by Greek historians; Dionysius quotes him once (F6),[8] and F. Altheim argued that he was the source of the Roman notices in books 11–20 of Diodorus (*RhM* 93 (1950), 267–86). Whether Polybius read him (or vice versa) we can only speculate: see comm. on F2, and note the suggestion of M. Gelzer (*Kl. Schr.* 3. 196) that Acilius was one of Polybius' sources for the so-called *archaeologia*. Mention may also be made of E. J. Bickerman's view (*CPh* 42 (1947), 137–46) that the letters exchanged between Pyrrhus and Laevinus went back to a source written in Greek between *c.*170 and 120, his preferred candidate being Acilius. Citations of Acilius may still appear in authors of the fourth century AD (F5, 8); but it is virtually certain that they knew of him only at second (or third) hand.

(EHB, SJN)

[8] Note also the view of M. T. Schettino, *Tradizione annalistica e tradizione ellenistica su Pirro in Dionigi (AR XIX–XX)* (Brussels, 1991), that Acilius was one of Dionysius' sources on Pyrrhus.

8

Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus

Editions: Peter 1[2]. clxxvii–clxxviii, 117–18; Chassignet 2. xvi–xix, 7.

Principal discussions: W. Harless, *De Fabiis et Aufidiis* (Bonn, 1853), 36–44; G. D. du Rieu, *Disputatio de gente Fabia. Accedunt Fabiorum Pictorum et Seruiliani fragmenta* (Leiden, 1856), 390–400; O. Tomasini, 'Per l'individuazione di fonti storiografiche anonime latine in Dionisio d'Alicarnasso', *AFLT* 1 (1964–5), 153–74 (*non uidimus*); L. Pepe, 'L'annalista Q. Fabio Massimo Serviliano', *StudUrb (B)* 49 (1975), 95–108; D. Liebs in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 564–5.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus was consul in 142 BC. He was the adopted son of a Q. Fabius Maximus (probably pr. 181), and brother by adoption of Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus (cos. 145) (App. *Hisp.* 67.283). He was a Servilius by birth, probably son of Cn. Servilius Caepio (cos. 169), and brother of Q. Servilius Caepio (cos. 140) (App. *Hisp.* 70.296).[1] Details of Servilianus' early career are unknown, but he must have held the praetorship, at the latest in 145, and at some point he became a *pontifex* (F3). He governed Further Spain, probably as consul in 142, and certainly as proconsul in 141–140.[2] In Spain he fought Viriathus, at first with some success, but his command ended in disaster when he was forced to capitulate. His treaty with Viriathus was subsequently repudiated, and war was resumed by his natural brother, Q. Servilius Caepio, who succeeded him in Further Spain. Servilianus is said to have cut off the hands of prisoners (Oros.5.4.8–12; Frontin. *strat.* 4.1.42; Val. Max. 2.7.11).

[1] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 52–3: *Q. Fabius Q.[f. Q. n. Maximus Se]ruilian(us)*; *MRR* 1.474. See Münzer (with Groag), *RE* 6. 1777–8 for family tree, and Münzer 1811–12, for descent. The supplement *Q. n.* in the *Fasti Capitolini* cannot be regarded as certain (cf. Badian, *Chiron* 20 (1990), 380). If it is false, the Münzer–Groag stemma is incorrect—the praetor of 181 would be son of an otherwise unknown brother of the consul of 213, a brother who cannot be a Quintus.

[2] App. *Hisp.* 67.283–69.293; Diod. 33.1.3–4; Livy *per.* 53–4; further sources and full details in Münzer, *RE* 6. 1812–13. See also Astin, *Scipio*, 315–6, for his political connections. The details of Spanish commands in this period are problematic. Astin, *Historia* 13 (1964), 245–54, argues strongly that Servilianus took up his command as consul in 142 rather than in 141 as proconsul. On the end of his command, and the problem of App. *Hisp.* 68.291, see Richardson, *Comm.* ad loc. Münzer suggested that Servilianus was the Fabius Maximus rebuked by the consuls for revealing senatorial decisions about declaration of the Third Punic War to a quaestor who was not yet a member of the senate (Val. Max. 2.2.1). It is unclear if the Fabius Maximus who was praetor in Sicily in 149 and through whom Carthaginian hostages were conveyed to Rome (Pol. 36.5.8–9) was Servilianus or, slightly more likely, his brother Aemilianus (Münzer, *RE* 6. 1792–3; Harless, *De Fabiis* (1853), 38). Val. Max. 6.1.5 speaks of him as censor, but this has long been recognized as an error, presumably the result of a confusion of Servilianus with his son Eburnus (cos. 116, cens. 108: see *MRR* 1. 550 n. 3).

Works

(a) *Historiae/Annales*

Fabius Maximus Servilianus[3] is cited as a writer only twice, once as the author of *historiae* (F2), and once from the twelfth book of an unnamed work (F3). All other references are uncertain in that they name a writer called simply 'Fabius Maximus' (T1, F1, F4), and could in theory refer to any of the bearers of that famous name. It goes without saying that texts referring only to 'Fabius' (F5–11) are even more problematic.

To take these cases individually, we may reasonably surmise that the Virgil commentators are citing from the same work, and that the Fabius Maximus cited by Servius Danielis (F1) is none other than Servilianus, quoted by the Verona Scholiast (F2). The fact that F1 speaks of *annales* and F2 of *historiae* is not a serious objection: these terms are frequently used interchangeably by citing authorities when referring loosely to historical works. Servilianus is the only Fabius Maximus known to have written history, and although the identification cannot be certain, it remains probable and has been accepted for the purposes of this collection. Apart from the fragments, the only testimonium to a Fabius Maximus as a historian is from DH, who claims to have used his work as one of his sources (T1).[4] DH's various lists of individual named historians in his opening chapters seem to be chronological, which would place Fabius Maximus between the time of Cato and that of Valerius Antias and Licinius Macer. This would be consistent with his being Servilianus, the consul of 142.

The remaining cases are more tenuous. F4 is attributed to a Fabius Maximus, but with no indication of the work from which it is taken, and while Servilianus may be their only historian, other Fabii Maximi come into contention in this instance. Most previous editors and commentators have attributed this fragment to a published funeral speech—either Fabius Cunctator's eulogy of his son, or the one delivered by Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus (cos. 121) for Scipio Aemilianus in 129 (see comm. on F4 for details). These suggestions are perfectly possible, but no more, and no less, likely than attribution to a work by Fabius Maximus Servilianus.

We may now turn to the difficult question of fragments attributed simply to 'Fabius'. While we can be confident that most of these should be assigned to Fabius Pictor, [5] in a few cases the matter is less clear. When Servius Danielis can cite both

[3] His adoption gave him a distinctive name, making it possible to differentiate him from other members of his adoptive family. But this condition applies only when he is firmly identified with the name Servilianus.

[4] There is no possibility of confusion with Fabius Pictor, whose work is discussed earlier at 1.6.2 and whose *cognomen* was known to DH: 1.79.4. See Peter 1. clxxvii–clxxviii for arguments on F1 and T1. For T1 see also Pepe, *StudUrb (B)* 49 (1975),100 n. 15.

[5] This must be true of all citations of 'Fabius' or 'Quintus Fabius' by Polybius (for chronological reasons), and most of those by DH, Livy, and Plutarch. Sometimes these authors make the matter clear by association (1 F5, F7 (DH: Fabius bracketed with Cincius)), or by some other means (e.g. 1 F16 (where Livy calls Fabius *longe antiquissimus auctor*); cf. 1 F10, F12, F23). In 1 F21a–b Eutropius and Orosius also clearly identify Pictor: *Fabius historicus, qui ei(dem) bello interfuit* (225 BC). Incidentally, Cicero's reference to *Fabios* in the plural at *div.* 1.55 is idiomatic, and clearly refers only to Fabius Pictor. The same goes for the plurals in T1. On this see introduction to Gn. Gellius (1. 253); cf. 1. 164, 363.

Fabius Maximus (F1) and Fabius Pictor (*Aen.* 12.603 (Fabius Pictor 1 F2); *georg.* 1.21), his two references simply to 'Fabius' (*Aen.* 5.73; 8.630) are ambiguous. In the light of this, we have included both as 'possible fragments' (F5–6). Some have thought that Gellius 5.4.1–3, cited from Fabius, might belong to Fabius Maximus Servilianus.[6] It has been included here as a possible fragment (F10=Fabius Pictor 1 F31), since elsewhere Gellius cites only Fabius Pictor's pontifical work (1.12.14; 10.15), and the extract he quotes here is clearly taken from a work in Latin.[7]

Of the scope, content, and character of Servilianus' history very little can be deduced from the testimonia and fragments.[8] DH's inclusion of Fabius Maximus among the historians approved by the Romans themselves (T1) is striking and shows that his work had some standing. Like most early histories, it went back at least to the arrival of Aeneas (F1, from book 1); but we have no information about where it ended, or indeed whether it was completed.

(b) ? A work on pontifical law

The existence of a work on pontifical law by Servilianus is commonly inferred from Macrobius (F3). Macrobius does not give a title, but calls the author *Seruilianus pontifex*, and cites him for information on the *atri dies*. The argument has some force, given the content of the extract, which states an obscure ritual prohibition that one would not automatically assign to a historical work; but this is hardly conclusive, and we cannot rule out the possibility that Servilianus included a digression on unlucky days in his history, especially as the aetiology of these days was commonly explained with reference to historical events; this is made clear by Macrobius, who cites in the course of his discussion extracts from Cassius Hemina (6 F23=Macr. 1.16.21–4), Cn. Gellius (14 F8=Macr. ibid.), and Claudius Quadrigarius (24 F53=Macr. 1.16.26). In view of this possibility we cannot confidently assign the fragment to a hypothetical work for which there is no explicit evidence; and we think it best not to give it a Latin title, as most modern commentators have done.[9] Instead we prefer to leave the matter open, and to include the extract as a fragment of an unspecified work.

(SJN)

[6] Both du Rieu, *Disputatio* (1856), 397, and Krause, 48, thought this a possibility.

[7] This rules out the famous Pictor's history, which was written in Greek. But two undoubted citations of Fabius Pictor in Latin (1 F4d–e) point to the existence of either a Latin translation of this work, or a different work by a later Fabius Pictor (see introduction to Fabius Pictor, I. 163–5). Nevertheless a reference by Gellius to the history of Fabius Maximus Servilianus, an approved author (T1), is perhaps no less likely than one to the Latin work by a Fabius Pictor.

[8] DH says that the works he lists (including Fabius Maximus') are 'like the Greek annalistic accounts' (*ταῖς Ἑλληνικαῖς χρονογραφίαις ἐοικυῖαι*), which may suggest that his history was annalistic in form. But since DH's list includes Cato's *Origines* this is hardly conclusive. Du Rieu (*Disputatio* (1856), 396) rightly rejected as unfounded the claim of Harless (*De Fabiis* (1853), 41–2) that Fabius Maximus' history had a *popularis* flavour.

[9] e.g. Chassignet xviii; cf. Liebs in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 565. Phrases such as *de iure pontificio* and *libri iuris pontificii*, which in modern discussions give the hypothetical work a bogus appearance of authenticity, go back to Peter, and before him to Vossius, but they can be forgiven as they were themselves writing in Latin; and Peter at least put the words *iuris pontificii* in brackets (118).

9

L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi

Editions: Peter 1[2]. clxxxi–cxcii, 120–38; A. Baudou, *Les Fragments des 'Annales' de L. Calpurnius Piso Censorius Frugi. Traduction et commentaire* (unpublished thesis, Université Laval, Quebec, 1993); G. Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition* (Lanham, New York, and London, 1994); Chassignet 2. xix–xxviii, 18–39, 114–30; Beck–Walter 1. 282–329.

Principal discussions: H. Liebaldt, *De L. Pisone, Annalium scriptore* (Naumburg, 1836); F. Münzer, 'Die Zeitrechnung des Annalisten Piso', *Hermes* 31 (1896), 308–12; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 199–239; W. Soltau, 'Der Annalist Piso', *Philologus* 56 (1897), 118–29; F. Münzer, 'L. Calpurnius (96) Piso Frugi', *RE* 3 (1899), 1392; C. Cichorius, 'L. Calpurnius (96) Piso Frugi', *RE* 3 (1899), 1392–5; J. Martha, 'L'Histoire à Rome. Les successeurs de Caton—C. Calpurnius Piso', *RCC* 11 (1902–3), 2.309–16; O. Leuze, 'Chronologisches zum Annalisten Piso', *Philologus* 66 (1907), 531–61; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 195–6; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 103–5; K. Latte, 'Der Historiker L. Calpurnius Frugi', *SDAW* 7 (1960), 3–16 (=*Kl. Schr.* (Munich, 1968), 837–47, reporting original pagination); F. Klingner, *Römische Geisteswelt*[5] (Munich, 1961), 77–8; S. Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* (1966) 2. 136–41; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 11–13; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 213–14; E. Rawson, 'The first Latin annalists', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 689–717, esp. 702–13 (=*Roman Culture* (1991), 245–71, esp. 257–67); Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), 9–26; L. Cardinali, 'Quanti libri scrisse L. Calpurnio Pisone Frugi? Congetture sull'estensione dell'opera', *Maia* 40 (1988), 45–55; N. Berti, 'La decadenza morale di Roma e i *viri antiqui*: riflessioni su alcuni frammenti degli *annali* di L. Calpurnio Pisone Frugi', *Prometheus* 15 (1989), 39–58, 145–59; G. Forsythe, 'Some notes on the History of Cassius Hemina', *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 326–44; A. Mehl, *Römische Geschichtsschreibung* (Stuttgart, 2001), 54–5; Suerbaum, in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 421–5; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 26–9; C. J. Smith, 'Pliny the Elder and archaic Rome', in E. Bispham *et al.* (eds.), *Vita Vigilia Est: Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick* (London, 2007), 147–70, esp. 156–60.

INTRODUCTION

Life

L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi attained the highest offices of state in a period of dramatic political, social, and cultural change for the Roman republic. Given that he was tribune of the plebs in 149 BC, he is likely to have been born in the late 180s or the early 170s.[1] The date of his praetorship (cf. below on Florus 2.7.7 = Forsythe T10) is not attested, but will probably have fallen within the years

[1] Peter suggests a *terminus ante quem* of 179 (clxxxi n. 1); Cardinali (*Maia* 40 (1988), 55) argues for one of 183, on the basis of a reference to the *senectus* of an opponent in a fragment of a speech by C. Gracchus (*ORF*[4] 43). However, a date as late as 176 or 175 is possible.

138–136.[2] He was consul in 133, serving as commander in the war against rebel slaves in Sicily, and censor in 120.[3] Despite his prominence, there is little clear information about his career.

Frugi (*RE* Calpurnius 96) may have been the grandson of C. (or Cn.) Piso (*RE* 61), the urban praetor of 211, and son of L. Calpurnius (*RE* 13), legate in 198 (Livy 32.19.11). C. Calpurnius Piso (*RE* 62), consul in 180, may have been his uncle: that man's sons L. Piso Caesoninus (*RE* 87), consul in 148, and Q. Piso (*RE* 86), consul in 135, would in that case be his cousins.[4] The relationship to Frugi of Cn. Piso (*RE* 73/11), consul in 139, is unclear.[5] Frugi was the fourth Calpurnius Piso to reach the consulship since 148. Forsythe argues that both branches of the family (Pisones Caesonini and Pisones Frugi) belonged to the Menenian tribe, and that they originated in the middle Tiber valley, in the borderlands of Etruscan and Sabine territory.[6]

We have no direct testimony about Piso's education or early career.[7] His second *cognomen* (*agnomen*) 'Frugi' is of some interest. Latte's attempt to represent the word as meaning simply 'capable' has not found favour, and it is generally agreed that it means 'upright' or 'honest' (cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.16–17=Forsythe T15).[8] It is not clear when Piso began to be called 'Frugi', or if he used the *agnomen* himself, although Cic. *Font.* 39 (=Forsythe T16A) does imply that it was used in his lifetime, specifically during C. Gracchus' tenure of the tribunate (when Gracchus orders Piso to be called to a public meeting, and the messenger asks which Piso, Gracchus complains that he is being forced to call his enemy 'Frugi'). There are various means whereby he could have acquired it, such as by his sponsoring of a law to set up the first permanent *quaestio* for the recovery of property which had been misappropriated by Roman officials (see below). Our first attestation of the *agnomen* is in Cic. 2 *Verr.* 3.195 (=T10),[9] one of several passages about Piso in later authors which describe his moral uprightness—and in two cases also that of his son—and which might conceivably derive from his history (T10–14: see below on the scope and economy of the work). T10 describes Piso's financial probity in the purchase of grain (apparently for Rome's food supply), presumably during his campaigning as consul in the slave war in Sicily

[2] Münzer (*RE* 3. 1392) dates his praetorship to 136; Broughton (*MRR* 1. 483 n. 1; 484) tentatively suggests 138; Forsythe (17–19) insists on either 137 or 136, and Brennan (*Praetorship*, 738) suggests 136 or earlier. Further discussion in I. Hofmann-Löbl, *Die Calpurnii* (Frankfurt, 1996), 73–5.

[3] His holding of the censorship is attested in F7, F14, F27, and F41. The date of 120 is not directly attested, but is the only one available (*MRR* 1. 523).

[4] See the stemmata in Forsythe (2), and I. Hofmann-Löbl, *Die Calpurnii* (Frankfurt, 1996), app. 1.

[5] Badian (*Chiron* 20 (1990), 399–400 n. 5) suggests that this Cn. Piso was the son of the consul of 180—so perhaps another cousin of Frugi—or alternatively was another son of Frugi's father L. Piso.

[6] Forsythe, *ZPE* 83 (1990), 293–8.

[7] For suggestions about the possible blend of Roman traditionalism and Greek culture involved, see Forsythe 25–32. It has been thought that his name should be restored in the so-called *Index Stoicorum*, a fragmentary papyrus from Herculaneum which lists pupils of Panaetius, but this is very doubtful: see Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 258 n. 66, with earlier bibliography; L. Cardinali, *BSL* 25 (1995), 426–30. It was accepted by Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 17 n. 54. Forsythe prints the text as his doubtful T25.

[8] Latte, *SDAW* 7 (1960), 3–4. See J.-N. Bonneville and S. Dardaine in *REA* 86 (1984), 217–44, esp. 218–20; Cardinali, *Maia* 40 (1988), 53–4.

[9] The forms of his name in earlier attestations are as follows: 'L. Piso L. f.' (*ILLRP* 1088=Forsythe T12); 'L. Calpurnius L. f.' (*Roman Statutes*, 1. 1.74=Forsythe T8); 'Calpurni Pisoni(s)' (Lucil. 574–5= Forsythe T6), if the law referred to here is Frugi's law *de pecuniis repetundis*.

(Cicero is here contrasting Piso with Verres).[10] T11 (Orosius 5.9.6) describes his killing of 8,000 runaway slaves during the storming of Murgantia in that war,[11] and his execution of those he captured, something which could be highly praiseworthy in Piso's day. T12a–b (Val. Max. 2.7.9–10; Frontin. *strat.* 4.1.26) recount the story of his strict discipline in the same war, when he is said to have inflicted a humiliating punishment on a cavalry prefect who had surrendered his arms to the enemy. T13a–b (Val. Max. 4.3.10; Pliny *nat.* 33.38, which contains a fragment of Piso's history (F23) on the earliest presentation of a gold crown to a citizen) describe Piso's care to be seen to act justly in awarding his own son a titular gold crown during that war. And T14 (Cic. 2 *Verr.* 4.56–7) describes Piso's son in 112 as living up to the *agnomen* 'Frugi' by his patent honesty when having a new gold ring made in Corduba in Further Spain during his praetorship (Cicero is here contrasting Piso's son with Verres, at the same time referring back to the uprightness of the father). It is likely that the *agnomen* was already familiar by the time that Piso's history was published, but references of this sort in the work might have helped to solidify its associations.[12] At any rate, it is unwise to draw any direct conclusions from the name itself about his actual behaviour,[13] and it is rather for his reputation that the name should be regarded as providing evidence.

His law on the recovery of property (*lex de repetundis*)[14] applied to the property of foreigners (*peregrini*), and seems to have involved the *praetor inter peregrinos*.[15] However, no safe deductions about his political sympathies can be made from his introduction of such a law. For one thing, it is not clear who exactly (if anyone) would have benefited from it. For another, it may be regarded as an intelligent instrument of foreign policy and public relations as much as a serious attempt to give redress for unjust losses suffered at the hands of Roman officials.[16]

If Frugi is the Piso mentioned by Florus in 2.7.7 (=Forsythe T10), then his praetorship will have involved unsuccessful campaigning in Sicily against the rebels of the first major slave uprising on the island; however, the identification is very doubtful.[17] As consul in 133 he did command Roman forces against the rebel slaves in Sicily. Besides capturing Murgantia (T11), he conducted the siege of Henna, from which twenty-nine of his sling-bullets survive (*ILLRP* 1088=Forsythe T12), but it was left to his successor P. Rupilius in the following year to reduce Henna and then

[10] Münzer, *RE* 3. 1392.

[11] Accepting Schaefer's emendation of the manuscript reading 'Mamertium' to 'Murgentium'.

[12] Interestingly, in F35 he recounts a story which suggests virtuous conduct by the freedman C. Furius Cresimus, whose cognomen could be translated as 'Frugi' (see comm.).

[13] As e.g. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 260.

[14] Cicero attests that Piso was the 'author or opponent of many laws' (*Brut.* 106=T3), and he may have had quite a busy tribunate, but this is the only law with which he can securely be associated. For the novelty of Piso's law, see Cic. *off.* 2.75 (=Forsythe T2); for the law as a response to greed, see Tac. *ann.* 15.20 (=Forsythe T3). Forsythe provides a useful collection of ancient sources on the law in his T1–9.

[15] See *Roman Statutes* 1. 52; Brennan, *Praetorship*, 235–7. J. S. Richardson dissents from the traditional view that the law was intended as protection for allies: *JRS* 77 (1987), 1–10.

[16] For discussion of his tribunate and the law, with previous bibliography, see I. Hofmann-Löbl, *Die Calpurnii* (Frankfurt, 1996), 68–73. A very positive interpretation of the law is to be found in Forsythe, *AncW* 17 (1988), 109–19, where Piso emerges as an honourable man attempting to defend his provincial clients. Gaius *inst.* 4.17b–19 (=Forsythe T9) refers to a *lex Calpurnia* of unclear date and content, which may or may not be connected with our author.

[17] See Brennan, *RFIC* 121 (1993), 166–7, and *Praetorship*, 738 and 900 n. 115.

finally crush the rebellion.[18] As noted above, Piso appears to have been involved in purchasing grain for the food supply of Rome (T10), is supposed to have introduced strict discipline into the Roman forces (T12a–b), and had his son serving with him (T13a–b).

It is not clear what was Piso's stance during his consulship on the agrarian legislation and political activity of the tribune Ti. Gracchus.[19] His later enmity with C. Gracchus (Cic. *Font.* 39 (=Forsythe T16A); Schol. Bob. Cic. *Flacc.* F10 96 (=Forsythe T16B); Cic. *Tusc.* 3.48 (=Forsythe T17)) does not inform us about his attitude to the elder brother. The first and second of these passages record vehement attacks on him by C. Gracchus in his oratory, while the third reports Piso's turning up to receive cut-price corn after the passing of Gracchus' grain law, although Piso himself had opposed the law, and represents Piso as accusing Gracchus of being financially irresponsible in passing it. According to a passage in Cicero's *Brutus* (T3), Piso was active in the courts, supported or opposed many laws, and published speeches, which had already disappeared by the time that Cicero was writing: it may be that they have played their part in influencing our sources, though that is nowhere clearly attested.

Piso's reputation was probably a significant factor in his being felt to be an appropriate candidate for the censorship. Unfortunately, nothing is recorded about his activity in that office, or about any subsequent political activity on his part. Nor is the date of his death recorded.

Work

We accept the attribution of forty-eight fragments to Piso. Forsythe added four to the forty-five originally identified by Peter (one deriving from Lydus (F47), the other three being the ones from the *OGR* that Peter had excluded—F3, F4, and F48). We have accepted these (see F47–8, comm., for the problems with those fragments), but have excluded Peter's F2 (Forsythe's F3), which we regard as a fragment of Hemina (6 F6: see comm. ad loc.).[20]

[18] Rupilius and Henna: Diodorus 34/35.2.21.

[19] D. C. Earl argues that Piso would have been a natural supporter of the bill (*Athenaeum* 38 (1960), 291–6). Astin (*Scipio*, 316–19) considers that the balance of evidence suggests that Piso is more likely to have opposed Tiberius Gracchus' plans than to have supported them or been neutral, though he admits that the evidence is not strong. See J. Briscoe in *JRS* 64 (1974), 132, on the paucity of evidence for this question. Rawson considers that the surviving fragments of Piso are not proof of an anti-Gracchan attitude (*Roman Culture*, 265). See F20, with comm., and F26, with comm. on Cincius 2 F4.

[20] The identification of Piso's fragments has been quite a gradual process. Of our forty-eight, all but nine were in Popma's edition (F3, F5, F6, F9, F18, F26, F27, F47, and F48, although F5, a shared fragment, did appear under Fabius Pictor). His list of thirty-nine fragments of Piso differed from Agustín's list of thirty-eight in not including F5 and in adding F4 and F13, while Riccoboni's second edition of 1579 had contained only sixteen fragments. Five fragments were added by editors of Sallust (F5 and F18 by Wasse in 1710, F6 by Haverkamp in 1742, and F9 and F48 by Frotscher in 1825); F3 was added by Krause in 1833; F26 and F27 by Roth in 1852; and F47 by Forsythe in 1994 (it had also been identified as a fragment of Piso by S. Mazzarino in 1971—see F47, comm.). Peter, accepting Ritschl's reconstruction, was the first to include the fragment that we have excluded (his F2, from the *Scholia Vernonensia* on Virgil), although Frotscher, Krause, and Roth were aware of the passage. However, in the second edition of *HRR* 1 he declared the attribution to Piso false.

It is not possible to fix an exact date for the composition of Piso's history. The latest date given in a fragment is 146 BC (F41), but references to Piso's activity as consul in Sicily, including the information that he awarded his own son a titular gold crown of three pounds for successful military action during those campaigns, may derive from his work (T10–13). It may be that Piso, like other senatorial historians, took up the pen in his later years and included in his work an account of events that he himself had witnessed. Forsythe has argued (32–6) that Piso's history must have been composed after his censorship in 120, on the grounds that his interest in the activity of censors (see below) may reflect his own experience of holding the office, and that all the references to him as *censorius* (or τιμητικός) come in authors who preserve fragments of his work, namely Dionysius (F7 (twice), F27), Pliny (F14), and Censorinus (F41). The latter of these arguments is the stronger of the two.[21] Münzer suggested that Piso was the source of Cicero's anecdote (T14) about his son's patent honesty when he had a new gold ring made in Corduba during his praetorship in 112 BC.[22] This would mean that Piso would have been composing his history (or would still have been doing so) in his late sixties or early seventies, but there is nothing intrinsically implausible about that. However, there is no evidence which can conclusively rule out a considerably earlier date of composition.

The title of Piso's work was probably *annales*, as has generally been thought.[23] It is referred to in this way on eleven occasions.[24] Two different expressions are used of Piso's work by Dionysius (ἐνιαύσιοι ἀναγραφαί (F16 and F27), and ἐνιαύσιοι πραγματεῖαι (F18)), but these may simply be regarded as Greek versions of *annales*.[25] The work is called once each *commentarii* (F14) and *historiae* (F17). All editions of Piso from Agustin (1595) to Frotscher (1825) list F14 as coming from book 1 of a separate work, the *commentarii*; from Popma's edition (1620) onwards, our F43–6 are listed as belonging to these separate *commentarii*.[26] However, as Krause plausibly argued (141–2), both *commentarii* and *historiae* are simply different ways of referring to the *annales*.[27] Following Frotscher and Krause, we place F48 separately at the end under the heading 'Epitomae', the relationship of which work to Piso's *annales* is not clear (see comm. ad loc. for the problems concerning this fragment).

[21] Cf. Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 574.

[22] F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart, 1920), 390–3. Mazzarino (*Pensiero storico* 2.1. 137–40) suggests that Piso was one of the main sources behind Appian's account of the Gracchan crisis (*b.c.* 1.7.26–17.73) and Diodorus' narrative of the Sicilian slave war (34/5.2).

[23] e.g. Wiseman (*Clio's Cosmetics*, 12–13). Chassignet (2. xxii) regards it as certain that this was the title, as did Cichorius (*RE* 3. 1392–3).

[24] T3, F2, F8, F11, F12/F15a, F15b, F20, F21, F29, F30, and F42; in addition, the singular is used in F10 and F38, where *annalis* should be taken as (*liber*) *annalis*, 'book of annals'. The singular is found alongside the plural in F29.

[25] In F7 Dionysius uses no term for Piso's work, but uses of him the verbs ἱστορεῖ, φησί, and γράφει; he uses the verb ἱστορεῖν of him also in F16 (ἱστορεῖ) and F18 (ἱστόρηκε). Plutarch also uses ἱστορεῖν of Piso in F13 (ἱστόρηκε).

[26] Agustin indicates that F43–5 belong to the *commentarii*, but does not include F46 (from Servius). To F43–6 Frotscher adds F6 (from Servius) and F9 (from Tertullian).

[27] Cichorius points out (*RE* 3. 1392–3, cf. Chassignet 2. xxii n. 82) that the authors who use these terms (Pliny and Priscian respectively) both refer elsewhere to the work as *annales* (F12/F15a; F15b; F21); in respect of Priscian's use of *annales* and *historiae* to refer to the same work of Piso, Cichorius was anticipated by Vossius (*Hist. Lat.*[2], 25). Similarly here, we refer to Piso's work as his 'annals' or his 'history'.

While the terms used to refer to Piso's writings in antiquity do not demonstrate that more than one work of our author is at issue, it is important to allow for the possibility that not every fragment attributed here simply to 'Piso' is a fragment of the history of L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi. Puccioni suggested that the references to 'Piso' in the *OGR* (F3, F4, and F48) were to C. Piso, who is included in our work as author 28.[28] That view is not accepted here because of the closeness between F2 and F3 (although see F48, comm., for the difficulties of *OGR* 18.2–3). But the possibility that more than one Piso is responsible for our fragments had been raised earlier. Indeed Roth's edition of 1852 groups the fragments under the heading 'L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi aliique Pisones', although the only other Piso he identifies apart from Frugi is C. Piso (whose one fragment appears as Roth's F48). Roth's heading may reflect the claim of Jahn in 1848 (following a suggestion in Krause, 144–5) that our F6 and F43–6 were the work of a Piso other than Frugi, although this had been challenged in 1849 by Hertz, who pointed out that there is no incompatibility between their content and that of the other fragments.[29] However, the question of whether 'Piso' in our fragments is always L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi should continue to be asked (perhaps particularly in respect of F6 and F46 (from Servius), F9 (from Tertullian), F43 (from Arnobius), F44–5 (from Macrobius), and F47 (from Lydus)).

There is considerable dispute about the extent to which Piso's *annales* marked an innovation in Roman historiography. It may be that he was the first prose historian to call his work *annales*, but he is not the only candidate for this.[30] More significant is the claim that he was the first Roman historian to provide his account of the republic with a fully annalistic framework.[31] F28, where Livy notes that Piso omitted the consuls for 307–306 BC Varr., makes it likely that he did employ such a framework, but, again, it is not at all clear that he was the first to do so.[32] Too little of Piso's work survives for us to make judgements about whether or not he had a regular structure for his account of

[28] *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 284–8; for the contrary view, see L. Cardinali in C. Santini, L. Zurli, and L. Cardinali (eds.), *Concentus ex Dissonis. Scritti in onore di Aldo Setaioli* (Naples, 2006), 137–50. Note that Martha seems to have confused Frugi and C. Piso in the heading 'C. Calpurnius Piso'.

[29] O. Jahn, *BSGW* 1 (1848), 416–30; M. Hertz, *Ein philologisch kritischer Streifzug* (Berlin, 1849), 13–21. In respect of F6 (naming the god of the asylum as Lucoris), Jahn regarded Dionysius' statement (2.15) that he did not know who was the god of the asylum as showing that this passage was not from a work of Piso Frugi, with whose annals Dionysius was very familiar. Hertz points out that an error of omission on Dionysius' part is hardly inconceivable (though he does countenance the possibility that the fragment belongs to a separate work of Piso's entitled *commentarii*).

[30] It is clear that Cassius Hemina (6) wrote before Piso (see introduction to Hemina, I. 220–1), and while the sources are divided on the question of his title, there is a good chance that it was *annales*. His work may also have been organized annalistically (cf. n. 32).

[31] e.g. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 259; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 12–19; Forsythe 38–42. Forsythe regards F30 as suggesting that Piso regularly recorded also the names of the curule aediles who were elected each year (both curule aediles are named with filiation in F30 (cf. F29)). It is perhaps unlikely that Piso gave the names of all magistrates under each year, as Cichorius thought (*RE* 3. 1394). Wiseman (16–18) thinks that Piso also included a list of triumphs.

[32] In fact Livy's argument in F28 (= Livy 9.44.4) seems itself to imply the existence of earlier annalistic accounts, which Piso either reproduced carelessly or deliberately rejected: thus Briscoe, *CR* 31 (1981), 50; Oakley, *Comm.* 4. 476–7. See introduction to Fabius Pictor (1), I. 173–4, and n. 64 (with further bibliography). As Rich has pointed out (in J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.), *Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 134 and n. 42), Cassius Hemina's history used consular dates (6 F27, 35, 40), and may have had an annalistic structure.

each year.[33] It is most unlikely that he narrated the regal period annalistically, although it is possible that he dated events under the kings by regnal years.[34]

The scope and structure of the work can be determined only within broad limits. Piso seems to have covered Roman history from the beginnings to his own day. The latest identifiable event given in a fragment dates from 146 BC (F41), but as noted above the work may have gone on to cover subsequent events, perhaps as far as 112 BC (or even further). An event of 158 BC is cited by Censorinus from a seventh book (F38), which led Peter and others to assume that Piso's work comprised seven books in all.[35] But if it went on to cover events of several subsequent decades, the likelihood is that it ran to eight or more, as Cardinali has suggested.[36]

The distribution of material between books cannot be reconstructed with any precision.[37] From F38 it appears that he regarded a *saeculum* as a period of 100 years, but there is no indication of a match between periods of that length and the structure of his work, although it is possible that this fragment, which refers to the start of the seventh *saeculum* of Rome's history, actually consists of the opening words of book 7 (see comm. ad loc.). The latest datable event from a fragment attributed by a citing author to book 1 is the census of Servius Tullius (F16), and an episode of the first year of the republic is cited from book 2 (F20). It is therefore possible that, as Peter and most of his successors have thought, book 1 extended to the end of the monarchy, and book 2 began with the new republic. However, while it is the case that other historians, including Livy and Dionysius, placed the expulsion of the kings at the end of a book and started the next with the beginning of the republic, there is no reason to assume that Piso must have done the same.[38] We have therefore grouped fragments dealing with the reign of Tarquinius Superbus (F18–19) under the heading 'Book 1 or 2' (for the position of F17, see comm. ad loc.). Of the two fragments attributed by citing authors to book 2, only F20 can be securely placed in context (it refers to the abdication of Tarquinius Collatinus in 509 BC Varr.); for the position of F21, see comm. ad loc. The next fixed point is provided by F29, which is quoted from book 3 and refers to events of 304 BC Varr. Although the chronological distance of F28 from the events referred to in F20 and F22–7 and its closeness to those referred to in F29 make it likely that it comes from book 3, we are not able to determine where the break

[33] According to Frier (*Libri Annales*, 270–84) a standard narrative pattern for the consular year, based on the *Annales Maximi*, was already present in Fabius Pictor. On the other hand, Rich has argued that the standard format found in Livy's account of the middle republic (bks. 21–45) was first devised by Valerius Antias: Rich, 'Structuring Roman History', and *BICS* 48 (2005), 155–7.

[34] Rawson (*Roman Culture*, 259) inferred from F18 that Piso dated events under the kings by their regnal years.

[35] 1[2]. clxxxiv (cf. Cichorius, *RE* 3, 1393). *Pace* Wiseman (*Clio's Cosmetics*, 10), F41, pertaining to 146 BC, is not explicitly cited as coming from Piso's seventh book.

[36] Cardinali, *Maia* 40 (1988), 52–3, comparing the economy of the works of Cato and Cn. Gellius, and arguing for eight books as the most likely total. He believes that Piso dealt with the events of his consulship, but rejects (49–52), on highly questionable grounds, the possibility that he went on to cover later events down to 120 or even 112 (see above).

[37] Most discussions of the structure of Piso's work are too optimistic when it comes to reconstructing the scope and content of individual books: e.g. Frier, *Libri Annales*, 259; Forsythe 38–9; Beck–Walter 284.

[38] Peter and Forsythe take this for granted in their assignment of fragments to books 1 and 2. Chassignet (2. xxiii n. 85) is more circumspect, and acknowledges that the conclusion is hypothetical.

between books 2 and 3 occurred, so F22–8 are all listed under 'Book 2 or 3'. The only other fragment cited with a book number is F38, which shows that the year 158 BC was treated in book 7; since F39 refers to the same year, we assign it to the same book. Fragments dealing with events between 304 BC Varr. and 158 (F30–7) are therefore ordered under 'Book 3 to 7', and those dealing with events after 158 (F40–1) under 'Book 7 or later'. Fragments of the *annales* that are not assignable to a particular book or a range of books come next (F42–7), in chronological order of citing authors. As noted above, the final fragment (F48) is listed separately as it purports to come from the 'Epitomae' of Piso (see comm. ad loc.).

Piso appears to have used earlier writers, oral traditions, and memorials as sources. Certain fragments suggest a penchant for trying to produce a logical account in cases where those of predecessors made little sense (F7 on the nobility of Tarpeia's actions; F18 on Arruns' and Tarquinius Superbus' being the grandsons and not the sons of Tarquinius Priscus), or simply correcting an erroneous tradition or mistaken author (F44 on the name of Vulcan's wife). As with other republican annalists Piso's account of the foundation legend and the monarchy is disproportionately represented in the surviving fragments, a bias that is more likely to reflect the interests of the citing authors than any particular tendency on Piso's part. Even so, it is possible that the work placed particular emphasis on King Numa, who is mentioned (or is likely to have been mentioned) in no fewer than six fragments (F11–15, F47); Piso perhaps subscribed to the view that the Calpurnii were descended from a son of Numa called Calpus (see F13, comm.). An interest in the census is suggested by F16; it has been claimed that this, taken together with Piso's interest in buildings and monuments (e.g. F6, F8, F11, F22[39]), suggests that his own censorship pre-dated the composition of his history (see above). Piso also seems to have liked firsts, if that is not simply a reflection of the interests of the citing authors.[40] He appears to show a considerable fondness for anecdotes, although the fragmentary nature of his work makes it impossible to see the relationship of these to his narrative.

The plainness of style which characterized Piso's work brought him the criticism of Cicero (T1–3),[41] and the praise of Gellius (T7–8),[42] to whom we are indebted for three of our six verbatim quotations (F10, F20, F29; the others are F17, F21, and F38 (the first two from Priscian, the third from Censorinus)). On his style see the General Introduction (Section 3, l. 26); cf. Forsythe 36–8. Piso's history clearly outlasted his speeches by a long distance (T3). Dionysius was impressed by his logic and followed his account against those of other authors on more than one occasion (F7, F18). Livy sometimes cites Piso's testimony with little enthusiasm (F24, F25); alternatively, he reports a Pisonian version neutrally and without attribution (1.11.9; cf. F7, with comm.). In the judgement of the elder Pliny, from whom thirteen fragments of Piso survive, he was a weighty author (T6; cf. F12/F15a, F40), and he is cited as an author for fifteen of Pliny's books (T5), including four in which no fragments are found (12, 14, 29, and 36). It is interesting to note that of the ancient

[39] See Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 261–5.

[40] See Northwood in N. V. Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdansk, 2007), 111; cf. l. 223, 254.

[41] Although hostile to the style of Piso's work, Cicero was full of praise for the man himself (T10; T14; *Font.* 39 (=Forsythe T16A); *Tusc.* 3.16–17 (=Forsythe T15)).

[42] In T9 (cf. F20), however, Gellius finds himself very puzzled at one of Piso's forms of expression.

judgements which survive of his work, the earliest, in Cicero, are the least favourable, while the latest, in Gellius, include the most favourable. It is likely that his work was read by Cicero, Varro, Dionysius, Livy, Pliny, and Gellius. It is not clear when it ceased to be read, since later references to it may have been taken from earlier authors who had quoted it. In fact Cichorius considered that it was through Varro (from whom F1, F8, and F11 survive) that the Pisonian fragments in Tertullian (F9), Lactantius (F2), Arnobius (F43), Macrobius (F44–5), and Servius (F6, F46) were transmitted, and probably also those in Plutarch (F13) and Censorinus (F38, F41).[43] Piso's vocabulary and morphology did not interest the grammarians much—there are only two fragments from Priscian (F17, F21), and none from Nonius. In the modern era judgements have ranged from the high esteem which Cichorius shows for Piso to the near-contempt exhibited by Latte, but views at both extremes might have been rather different had more of his text survived.

It may well be that one of Piso's most significant contributions to Roman historiography was the high moral tone which seems to have pervaded his work, and which can be seen as strikingly similar to that encountered in Cato's oratory and other contemporary sources (see Pol. 31.25, with Walbank's comm. ad loc.). Piso may not have been the first historian to take this line, but he is the first for whom there is clear evidence of such an approach: it is important to note that the numerous fragments of Cato's *Origines* contain little sign of such moralizing (cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 260). A number of the relevant fragments of Piso are from Pliny (see especially F35, F36, and F40), who cites him in the *Natural History* more frequently than any other Roman historian. Pliny had his own moral agenda,[44] and, as Smith has pointed out,[45] his use of Piso has had a significant impact on our understanding of Piso's work. On the other hand, moralizing is also evident in fragments preserved by other authors, and it is likely that it was precisely the strong moralizing strain in Piso that attracted Pliny to him.

In F7 (from Dionysius) Piso rehabilitates Tarpeia, making her a patriotic heroine rather than a greedy traitor. F10 (from Gellius) recounts the moderation of Romulus in his consumption of wine, and may well have followed an account of his moderate expenditure as a host (see comm. ad loc.). In F27 (also from Dionysius), Piso's account of the first *lectisternium*, a contrast is made between the honesty and good conduct of all concerned, including foreigners and slaves, and the usual behaviour at festivals, which are accompanied by 'much outrageous and lawless behaviour through drunkenness'. A fragment quoted by Cicero (F42) contains the complaint that 'young men are devoted to their penis': although no direct contrast is there made with the behaviour of young men in the past, the remark is clearly to be taken as referring to Piso's own day. It is difficult to say if in F29 (Gellius), concerning the freedman's son Cn. Flavius, who became curule aedile, Piso is expressing approval or disapproval of the man (cf. comm. ad loc.); but Pliny's evidence suggests that he does approve of the freedman C. Furius Cresimus (F35), who was acquitted of using magic potions

[43] *RE* 3. 1395.

[44] S. Citroni Marchetti, *Plinio il vecchio e la tradizione del moralismo romano* (Pisa, 1991); M. Beagon, *Roman Nature* (Oxford, 1992), 75–9, 190–4.

[45] *Vita Vigilia Est* (2007), 159.

to make his crops grow by bringing forward his healthy slaves, well-made tools, and well-fed cattle, and referring to his work at night, his vigilance, and his sweat.

The items described by Piso in F36 (from Pliny) as having first been introduced in the triumph of Cn. Manlius (187 BC), namely dining couches decorated with bronze, sideboards, and one-legged tables, recur in Livy's description of the same triumph (39.6.3–7.5), and it is not unlikely that Livy's reference to this as representing the 'origin of foreign luxury' (*origo peregrinae luxuriae*) derives from Piso. Finally, in F40 (from Pliny) Piso dates the point at which *pudicitia*, 'chastity', began to be undermined to the censorship of M. Messalla and C. Cassius (154–153 BC). There is no simple chronology of decline that one can deduce from Piso's fragments, but the overall picture which they convey is clearly that Roman morals were better in the past than in his own lifetime.[46] To that extent at least, he may be considered a significant forerunner of Sallust,[47] Livy, and Tacitus.

It is not easy to connect Piso's life closely with the content or tone of his history. But Valerius Maximus' remark (4.3.10=T13a) that Sicily was liberated from the slave war by Piso does appear exaggerated, given that the conflict was only brought to an end under his successor P. Rupilius, and Cardinali plausibly suggests that the claim may have derived from Piso's own account.[48] It is a reasonable conjecture that there was an element of *apologia pro uita sua* in Piso's work, specifically that he felt the need to portray what was at best only limited success in Sicily as a great victory, referring also to his introduction of stern discipline (T12a–b).[49] If Piso's history did contain such an element of *apologia*, this is another way in which it foreshadowed the works of Sallust and Tacitus.

(MPP)

[46] In general see the account of N. Berti, *Prometheus* 15 (1989), 39–58; 145–59.

[47] Cardinali (*BSL* 25 (1995), 434–7) compares F42 with Sall. *Iug.* 85.41, and argues for direct influence.

[48] *Maia* 40 (1988), 48 n. 20.

[49] See Livy *per.* 58; cf. Cardinali, *Maia* 40 (1988), 49. It is possible that Piso was also seeking to convey an image of himself which contrasted with that of another Calpurnius Piso—Caesoninus, consul in 148, who may have been his cousin: the latter's failure to maintain discipline in the army in Africa during the Third Punic War was said to have led to its moral decline, until Scipio Aemilianus took over (App. *Pun.* 109.515–116.553, for which Polybius may have been a source); cf. N. Berti, *Prometheus* 15 (1989), 43.

10

C. Sempronius Tuditanus

Editions: Peter 1², cci–cciii, 143–7; Chassignet 2. xxviii–xxxiii, 40–3; Beck–Walter, 330–9.

Principal discussions: C. Cichorius, 'Das Geschichtswerk des Sempronius Tuditanus', *WS* 24 (1902), 588–95; id., *Untersuch. Lucilius* (1908), 125–6, 183–92, 340; Münzer, 'C. Sempronius (92) Tuditanus', *RE* 2A (1923), 1442–3; Schanz–Hosius 1⁴ (1927), 196–7; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 105–6; D. Liebs in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 568; M. Sehlmeyer, 'Die Anfänge der antiquarischen Literatur in Rom', in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG* (2003), 157–71.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The existence of this lost author can be deduced from passages that are variously attributed to *Tuditanus* (F1, 3, 6–8),[1] *C. Tuditanus* (F2), *Γάιος Σεμπρώνιος* (F4), and *Sempronius* (F5). That all these references are to one and the same person, a historian named C. Sempronius Tuditanus, is a synthetic construct based on a process of deduction that requires caution. We are inclined tentatively to accept this interpretation, and therefore include all the fragments under this name; but we do so in the knowledge that the reconstruction is fragile and that other possibilities exist. There is a good chance that we are dealing with more than one work, and therefore perhaps with more than one author. It must be admitted moreover that Sempronius was a relatively common name, and one that was borne by other known historical writers; but as it is almost unthinkable that Gaius Gracchus (11) is referred to in F4 or 5, and as these fragments are unlikely to have appeared in the work of Asellio (20), it seems convenient as well as most economical to include them all under Tuditanus.

There is no secure indication of his date save that he is likely to have written later than 150 BC (he can hardly be earlier than Cato), and that he was quoted by M. Valerius Messalla Rufus, the consul of 53 BC (F2). He is named in the company of other writers who belong in the later second and first centuries BC (see below). The family of the Sempronii Tuditani was prominent during the second and third centuries BC, producing consuls in 240, 204, 185, and 129; but there can be no certainty that our author was a public figure or that he is to be identified with any other known bearer of his name. Nevertheless it is widely assumed that the writer was identical with the consul of 129 BC.[2] This view was accepted by Peter, Münzer,

[1] On F9 see comm. ad loc.

[2] He was quaestor in 145 (Cic. *Att.* 13.4.1), possibly curule aedile in 135 (*MRR* 3. 190), and praetor in 132 (Cic. *Att.* 13.32.3). As he held his curule offices at the minimum age (Cic. ibid.), he must have been born in 172. As consul Tuditanus was charged by the senate with deciding disputes over *ager publicus*

and Cichorius, and is stated as a fact by most subsequent editors and commentators, without a hint that there might be any uncertainty in the matter.[3] It must be firmly stated, however, that the identification is not supported by any evidence whatsoever. The historian could equally have been father,[4] son,[5] a more remote descendant, or a collateral relative[6] of the consul of 129 BC.

Works

F1 is cited by Macrobius from book 3 of a work on magistrates (or magistracies: *magistratus*), which may be identical with the *commentarii* cited by Aulus Gellius in F2 (but see comm. on F2). The title of the former and the content of the latter combine to suggest a work on constitutional antiquities, containing at least thirteen books (F2). None of the other fragments is ascribed to a named work, and this fact allowed Cichorius to argue that Sempronius Tuditanus was the author of a single antiquarian work, the *magistratus*, to which all the fragments belong.[7] On the other hand Dionysius of Halicarnassus calls Sempronius a *συγγραφεύς* (T1),[8] and he is mentioned alongside Cato (T1), Cassius Hemina (F1, 3), Piso (F3), Antias (F1, 3), Macer (F1), Livy (F7), and Tubero (F8).[9] Peter (ccii–cciii) therefore reasonably maintained, against Cichorius, that Tuditanus should be regarded as a historian, and credited him with a second work, which he ventured to call *annales* (143). Although this title is conjectural, the evidence suggests that Peter's view is probably correct. F4–5 have no clear connection with magistrates, and it is hard to see F8 (the story of Regulus) as anything other than a piece of historical narrative. F9 is also characteristic of a historical work. F3, 6, and 7 would fit equally into a history or a work on antiquities. The narrative history would have adopted the traditional format, starting with the origins (F4–5) and extending to the third and second centuries (F8, F9), perhaps to the author's own time. If F3 belongs to the history, it went down as far as 181 BC, and if the text we have printed in F3 is correct (see apparatus and comm. ad loc.), it would have contained at least thirteen books.

involving Italian allies, but abandoned this task and set off to campaign in Illyria (App. *b.c.* 1.19.80 with Gabba's note ad loc.). After initial setbacks, he won a victory (Livy *per.* 59), left memorials of his presence in the area (*ILLRP* 334–5; Plin. *nat.* 3.129), and celebrated a triumph over the Iapydes (*Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.83; see M. G. Morgan, *Philologus* 117 (1973), 29–48). Cichorius (*Untersuch. Lucilius*, 183–92) identified this with the Histrian War mentioned by Lucilius 1079–87 and Hostius (*FPL* 76–8). Tuditanus was Hortensius' maternal grandfather (Cic. *Att.* 13.6.4), and was highly regarded by Cicero both as a man and as an orator (*Brut.* 95).

[3] The identification is taken for granted by Chassignet and Beck–Walter, and also by Schanz–Hosius and Bardon. So too Badian in *OCD*[3] 1345; G. Forsythe in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic* (Rome, 2000), 10–11; Liebs in Herzog–Schmidt 1, 568; Sehlmeyer in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG*, 163–4.

[4] Cic. *Att.* 13.4.1; 13.6.4; and see Münzer, *RE* 2A. 1440–1 (no. 91).

[5] *RE* no. 89. He was identified by Cichorius (*Untersuch. Lucilius*, 4) with the C. Sempronius C.f. Falerna (*RE* no. 6) of the *s.c. de agro Pergameno* (Sherk, *RDGE* 12 line 26; on this document see introduction to Aufidius (17)); so too Badian, *LCM* 11 (1986), 16, and cf. Brennan, *Praetorship*, 673.

[6] e.g. C. Sempronius Cn.f. Falerna (*RE* no. 5), listed in Jos. *AJ* 13.260 (132 BC?).

[7] *WS* 24 (1902), 588–95. Cichorius was followed by Münzer, but otherwise his extreme view won no adherents until it was revived in 2003 by Sehlmeyer (in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG*, 163–4).

[8] In the context this can only mean 'a historian', *pace* Sehlmeyer in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG*, 164 n. 37.

[9] In F8 Gellius' phrases *in Tuditani libris . . . Tubero in historiis* are not be taken as a deliberate contrast between Tuditanus and a historian.

A further possibility is to turn Cichorius's theory on its head, and to attribute all the fragments to a historical work (or works), albeit one(s) containing antiquarian material. As for titles, *commentarii* can sometimes signify a historical work (but see introduction to Cicero (39)): it is used by Pliny of Piso's *Annals* (*nat.* 13.87=Piso 9 F14). Even *magistratus* could be the title of a work of history, if Wiseman is right to see it as a chronological list of magistrates, annotated with notices of laws, military campaigns, and other events.[10] As a parallel he cites Atticus' *liber annalis* (described by Nepos *Att.* 18.1=Atticus 33 T1), which is cited together with Tuditanus in F7. In a number of passages Livy brackets *ueteres annales* (or *annales prisci*) with *libri magistratuum*: 4.7.10; 4.20.8 (referring to the *libri lintei*); cf. 9.18.12, with Oakley's note ad loc. On the other hand it is hard to see how F4–5 would fit into an annotated list of magistrates, and the same could be said of F7 (the Regulus narrative). One is bound to say that if all the fragments belong to a single diffuse work of history, *magistratus* would hardly be an appropriate title. We conclude therefore that we are dealing with two or more works, at least one of which was a chronological narrative history; but the character of the *libri magistratuum*, and of the *commentarii* if they are not the same thing, remains uncertain.

Nothing can be deduced from the surviving fragments about the historian's politics, and arguments based on the real or supposed views of the consul of 129 beg the question; there is not enough of Tuditanus' account of the first tribunes (F7) or the *decemuiri* (F1) to permit a judgement about any ideological slant.[11] Münzer's argument that the different opinions of Tuditanus and Junius Congus Gracchanus on intercalation reflect political differences is unsustainable.[12]

Arrangement of the fragments

We include all the fragments which appear in Peter, leaving open the possibility that some of them may be taken from antiquarian works rather than from a history (see above; note that Chassignet excludes F1–2, Beck–Walter F1). We start with those assigned to named works, followed by the unassigned fragments. Of these, F3 comes first as it is cited with a book number. The remainder are listed in chronological order of the events referred to.

(CJS)

[10] Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 13. He is wrong, however, to call it a *liber magistratuum* (singular). In Wiseman's opinion, Tuditanus would have been one of the first historians, along with Piso, to write year-by-year annals. Forsythe's view (*Piso*, 50; and in Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic* (Rome, 2000), 11) that Tuditanus wrote later than Piso, and that F3, 7, and 9 are based on him, is unwarranted.

[11] Liebs in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 568, offers no evidence to support his view that 'in dem Werk (sc. die *libri magistratuum*) . . . wird der optimatische Standpunkt verfochten worden sein.'

[12] Münzer, *RE* 2A. 1442, partly following Cichorius, *Untersuch. Lucilius*, 125–7. See also Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 105; Chassignet xxx; Sehlmeyer in Eigler *et al.* (eds), *Formen RG*, 166–7.

11

C. Sempronius Gracchus

Editions: Peter I^2, clxxix–clxxx, 119.

Principal discussions: Badian, 'Early historians', 13–14; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 503; F. Santangelo, 'The religious tradition of the Gracchi', *ARG* 7 (2005), 198–214; J. M. Candau, 'Republican Rome' in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 121–59, at 132–3.

INTRODUCTION

It is unnecessary for the present purpose to describe—or cite, as testimonia, the evidence for—the career of Gaius Sempronius Gracchus, tribune of the plebs in 123 and 122 BC.

The only references to Gaius' writings are the two fragments.[1] Plutarch in F2 talks of a book (*βιβλίον*). Cicero uses the words *scriptum reliquit* (F1a) and *ad M. Pomponium scripsit* (F1b). Since F1 concerns Gaius' father and F2 his brother, it is very probable that both come from the same work, and that *ad M. Pomponium scripsit* refers to the dedication of the work, not to a letter (cf. Aemilius Scaurus 18 T1, T3, and Coelius Antipater 15 F46 *ad te scriptas . . . misimus*).[2]

It is by no means certain, however, that we have to do with a historical work; even if so, it was perhaps no more than a family history (the singular *βιβλίον* does not mean that it consisted of only one book). It is equally possible that the book was a political pamphlet, justifying the policy of Gaius and his brother. F1, emphasizing the high moral principles of their father, would not have been out of place in such a work.

Badian's confidence that the work was a political biography of Tiberius, and that much else in Plutarch's life of the tribune of 133 derives from it, is unjustified.

(JB)

[1] They were included by Peter, but omitted, without comment, by Chassignet and Beck–Walter.

[2] See bibliography in Pease's note on F1a.

12

C. Fannius

Editions: Peter 1^2. cxciii–cxcix, 139–41; Chassignet 2. xxxiii–xl, 44–7; Beck–Walter 1. 340–6.

Principal discussions: O. Hirschfeld, 'Die Annalen des C. Fannius', *WS* 6 (1884), 127–8 (=*Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1913), 776–7); Schanz, *GRL* 132; E. Kornemann, *Zur Geschichte der Gracchenzeit* (*Klio* Beiheft 1 (1903)); F. Münzer, 'Fannius (7)', *RE* 6.2 (1909), 1987–91; P. Fraccaro, 'Sui Fannii dell'età graccana', *Rend. Acc. Lincei* 19 (1910), 656–74 (=*Opuscula* 2. 103–17); Leo, *GRL* 333–4; F. Münzer, 'Die Fanniusfrage', *Hermes* 55 (1920), 427–42; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 169–71; P. Fraccaro, 'Ancora sulla questione dei Fannii', *Athenaeum* NS 4 (1926), 153–60 (=*Opuscula* 2. 119–23); Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 198–200; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 106–8; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* 4 (Cambridge, 1966), 400–3; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 14–15; H. Strasburger, 'Die Scipionenkreis', *Hermes* 94 (1966), 60–72; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1 (1966), 393–430; 2.2. 19–20, 198; Sumner, *Orators* (1973), 53–5, 170–4; F. Càssola, 'I Fannii in età repubblicana', *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 84–112, esp. 86–96; Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker* (1993), 129–34, 280–9; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 425–7.

INTRODUCTION

Life

There is considerable uncertainty about the identity of the historian C. Fannius. A number of prominent persons named C. Fannius are known from the relevant period (the later second century BC), but it is a matter of dispute which of them, if any, is to be identified with the historian. This well-known problem, 'die Fanniusfrage' as Münzer called it,[1] is peculiarly intractable; it was already a puzzle for Cicero.

In the *Brutus* of 46 BC (T3) Cicero identified two orators named C. Fannius, both active in the later second century: one, the son of Gaius, was a distinguished tribune of the plebs and later consul (in 122 BC, when he made a famous speech against C. Gracchus' proposal to extend the Roman citizenship to the Latins); the other, the son of Marcus, was son-in-law of Laelius, a pupil of Panaetius, and author of a history. But Cicero himself later realised that matters might not be so simple (letter quoted in T4, written in June 45 BC: for the problem of the text see Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 4. 402–3), and his account in T3 is demonstrably erroneous on at least one point: the consul of 122, it seems, was M.f., not C.f.[2] In his comment on *CIL* 1. 560 Mommsen argued that Cicero's notion of two distinct C. Fannii was simply

[1] *Hermes* 55 (1920), 427–42.

[2] This is clear from *CIL* 1.560 (=$1.^2$ 658; 6.1306; *ILLRP* 269): *C. Fanni(us) M.f. co(n)s(ul) de sena(tus) sen(tentia) dedit*. This must refer to the consul of 122, since the only other consular Fannius, C. Fannius Strabo (cos. 161), was C.f. C.n. (*fasti Capitolini*; see further Broughton, *MRR* 1. 443).

mistaken; in fact there was only one, and all the biographical details listed by Cicero, and indeed those reported in other sources too, refer to one and the same man, C. Fannius M.f., consul of 122, son-in-law of Laelius and writer of history.

Mommsen's theory was subsequently refined by Münzer,[3] who pointed out that the C. Fannius who served on an embassy in Greece in 146 BC (Pol. 38.12.1) cannot have been the historian, who at the time in question was climbing walls at Carthage (T5); there must therefore have been two C. Fannii, and it was this fact, according to Münzer, that confused Cicero. The existence of a C. Fannius C.f. (of senatorial, probably praetorian, rank) has subsequently been confirmed by an inscription.[4] On either view, however, Cicero got things wrong in the *Brutus* passage (T3), and himself later realized that the tribune who went on to become consul was C. Fannius M.f. (*Att.* 16.13, a letter of November 44). According to Münzer he must by now have accepted that this Fannius was identical with the son-in-law of Laelius, whom he continued to describe as son of Marcus (*am.* 3, written early in 44). Finally, in the letter of June 45 (T4) he says that Brutus' epitome of Fannius contradicts Atticus and supports his own earlier opinion, based on Hortensius, that Fannius the son-in-law of Laelius and Fannius the historian were identical.

In this way Münzer arrived at the same effective result as Mommsen, by identifying the consul of 122, the son-in-law of Laelius, and the historian with C. Fannius M.f. The existence of a second C. Fannius, C.f., was admitted, but he was consigned to a ghostly limbo.[5] In this form Münzer's revised version of Mommsen's theory has been widely accepted, and is now the standard view.[6] But there have been some dissenting voices, and the controversy refuses to die down.[7] In particular, P. Fraccaro raised two objections that have never been effectively answered.[8] First, it is clear from T4 that Atticus had rejected the identification of the historian and the son-in-law of Laelius. Atticus was an expert, whose opinions should not be lightly ignored. Cicero read something in Brutus' epitome of Fannius that seemed to contradict Atticus. We do not know what it was, but in asking Atticus to sort out the muddle Cicero no doubt

[3] *RE* 6 (1909), 1987–91; *Hermes* 55 (1920), 427–42.

[4] H. van Effenterre, *REA* 44 (1942), 31–51, esp. 36, lines 64 ff. The inscription, from Crete, dates probably from 113, and in any case between 116 and 112. That C. Fannius C.f. was of praetorian status is based on the assumption that the envoys are listed in order of senatorial rank. This means that Fannius, who is listed after Q. Fabius Maximus (either Allobrogicus, cos. 121, or Eburnus, cos. 116) cannot be identified with the consul of 122 (who is thus confirmed as M.f.—see n. 2). But he is listed before P. Rutilius (Rufus), who was praetor in or before 118 (Broughton, *MRR* 1. 527); he must himself therefore have been praetor before 118 BC. Full discussion in Broughton, *MRR* 1. 519 n. 2; 536, 537 n. 5.

[5] Münzer suggested that he had died young (*Hermes* 55 (1920), 442). This conjecture was overturned by the discovery of the Cretan inscription (see n. 4), which proved that he went on to follow a senatorial career, and was still alive in *c.*113 BC.

[6] Accepted by e.g. Kornemann, *Gesch. der Gracchenzeit* (1903), 21–37; Peter 1[2]. cxciii–cxcvi; Schanz–Hosius 1[4], 198–9; Broughton, *MRR* 1. 519 n. 2; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico*, 2.1. 430; Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 4. 400–3 (but rejecting Münzer's reading of the text of T4); Badian, 'Early historians', 14, 32 n. 60 ('the identity can now be regarded as certain'); Sumner, *Orators*, 53–5, 171–3 (with interesting further modifications); J. Briscoe, *JRS* 64 (1974), 130; Chassignet 2. xxxv. Cässola offers a detailed restatement of the case in *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 88–96.

[7] e.g. Gruen, *Roman Politics*, 66–7; Douglas, *Cicero, Brutus*, 84; and see now C. B. R. Pelling in *OCD*[4] s.v. Fannius, 567: 'His identification with the historian . . . remains uncertain.'

[8] Fraccaro, *Opuscula* 2. 103–17, 119–23. Fraccaro's view is followed by Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 170; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 106; E. Malcovati, *ORF*[4] 142–3; Astin, *Scipio*, 4 n. 4, 84 n. 2; R. J. Rowland, *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 373.

expected him to have an answer. Cicero's tone in T4 does not suggest that Atticus has been proved wrong, but rather that there is some discrepancy that he will be able to explain. In any case, if it were simply Atticus' word against Brutus', one would be rash to assume that Brutus must have been right and Atticus wrong.[9]

More compelling is Fraccaro's second point, that Cicero and his associates (Atticus, Hortensius, Brutus) all knew the *Annals* of Fannius well; T1 shows that Cicero had read them long before he wrote the *Brutus*, and yet he (and possibly also Hortensius) was firmly of the opinion that the consul of 122 and the historian were different persons, and there is no evidence that he ever changed his mind on this point (the question in T4 was whether the historian was the son-in-law of Laelius, a completely different matter). Now if the historian were the same man as the consul of 122, whose actions in that year were so momentous, surely this fact would have been obvious in his text? The man who boasted about his exploits with Tiberius Gracchus at Carthage would hardly have been silent about his role in the most important political upheaval of the time. Incidentally, this argument decisively refutes the theory that Fannius F1 is part of a defence of his change of stance during his consulship (see commentary, ad. loc.).

On the available evidence it is possible to provide each of the two C. Fannii—C.f. and M.f.—with a skeletal curriculum vitae, as follows:

C. Fannius, C.f., possibly son of the consul of 161; tribune of the plebs in 142 or 141;[10] praetor before 118; member of a senatorial embassy to Crete in 113.[11]

C. Fannius, M.f., possibly nephew of the consul of 161 and first cousin of the above; married Laelius' younger daughter (T3, 4; also Cic. *rep.* 1.18; *am.* 3); served with distinction as military tribune in Spain in 141 (App. *Ib.* 67.286–7); tribune of the plebs in or after 139 (see n. 10), praetor possibly in 126 (Jos. *AJ* 13.260–6, with Broughton's note in *MRR* 1. 509; cf. Càssola, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 87–8); consul in 122.[12]

In 146 one of the two (the historian) served under Scipio at Carthage (T5); the other went on an embassy to the Peloponnese (Pol. 38.12.1). The question is: which was which?

[9] But Càssola is right to insist that one should not automatically assume the contrary (*Vichiana* 12 (1983), 94–5).

[10] In *Att.* 16.13 Cicero asks Atticus whether C. Fannius M.f. was tribune in this year. But Sumner (*Orators*, 53–4) pointed out that a gap of twenty years between tribunate and consulship is exceptional for this period, and that C. Fannius M.f. (cos. 122) is unlikely to have been tribune in 142. Càssola (*Vichiana* 12 (1983), 95–6) suggests that Cicero knew only that as tribune Fannius acted under the patronage and authority of Scipio (T3), and erroneously inferred that he held the office during Scipio's censorship in 142–141; he proposes 137 as a more likely date. We prefer Sumner's solution, accepted e.g. by Broughton, *MRR* 3. 90, namely that Fannius the tribune of 142 was C.f., and that C. Fannius M.f. held the tribunate in or after 139 BC.

[11] There is also a chance that he is the same man as the Gaius Fannius son of Gaius mentioned in a decree recorded by Josephus (*AJ* 14.233); if so we should have to conclude that he served as governor of Asia during and after his praetorship. But this is only an outside chance; more probably the Josephus decree refers to C. Fannius Strabo, the consul of 161 (possibly our Fannius' father); thus M. Holleaux, *Στρατηγὸς ὕπατος* (Paris, 1918), 5; Münzer, *Hermes* 55 (1920), 437 n. 1; a less plausible alternative is that it refers to the C. Fannius (*RE* 9) who was praetor in the late 50s and propraetor in 49–48 (Broughton, *MRR* 3 (Suppl.), 90). In general see Càssola, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 85; D. Gera, *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics, 219–161 BCE* (Leiden, 1998), 310–11.

[12] Further details in Càssola, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 95–6.

On balance we would favour the identification of the historian with the first Fannius (C.f.), on the grounds that Cicero, although he undoubtedly confused the two Fannii in the *Brutus*, was nevertheless certain that the consul of 122 and the historian were different persons. This argument is based not only on the assumption that the ex-consul would have written about his own actions if he had been the author, but also on the fact that Cicero differentiates clearly between the rhetorical styles of the two men. The speech of the consul of 122 was the best of its time, and he was never considered tongue-tied (*elinguis*—T3). The other Fannius (the historian), however, was *durior*, both in character and speech, a judgement that Cicero quite evidently based on the style of the history. This distinction between the two Fannii in the *Brutus* is the one thing that Cicero is clear about, and his judgement in such matters is not to be dismissed.[13]

Work

Little survives of the historical work of C. Fannius—at best about six or seven brief and enigmatic fragments. It was certainly called *Annales* (T2, F1, 2, 3, 7b); Cicero's use of *historia* in F7c is merely elegant variation. It contained at least eight books (F2, 3). The title *Annales* might imply that it went back into the distant past, perhaps even to the founding of the city;[14] and if F3 is taken as evidence that the First Punic War occurred in book 8, it would follow that Fannius gave an extensive account of the early history of Rome. But this seems unlikely. If Fannius had devoted eight books to the period before the First Punic War, we should know; his account would have been more extensive than Piso (seven books in all), Cassius Hemina (four books), and Cato (seven books), and it would certainly have been referred to by Livy and Dionysius. It is equally likely that F3 refers to the Sicilian slave war of 135–132 (see comm. ad loc.), and it is possible, as Badian points out,[15] that Fannius covered the early history, if at all, in a brief introductory section. All the certainly identifiable fragments deal with his own lifetime; the earliest event is the Third Punic War (F4, but T4 implies that it contained information about the magistrates of 149 BC), and the latest the death of P. Rupilius (in or before 129—F6, with comm. ad loc.).

If this is right, Fannius must be seen as one of the first (if not *the* first) of the Roman historians to write exclusively contemporary history. Another was his younger

[13] Note however that Sumner (*Orators*, 173–4) draws the opposite conclusion from the same evidence. He takes Cicero to be saying that the consul of 122 was a mediocre orator who 'almost accidentally and unexpectedly' produced one good speech, whereas the historian was somewhat better: his literary skills 'were not perfect, but they were a good deal more than mediocre'. Cicero ought to have concluded that the history showed exactly the orator that C. Fannius M.f. was. Others have argued along similar lines (e.g. Kornemann, *Gesch. der Gracchenzeit* (1903), 22; Càssola, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 94). But in the absence of the texts in question it is difficult to say what Cicero 'ought to have' concluded. In our view it is safer to accept the opinion of Cicero (who had read the texts) that they were by different authors. Cf. G. L. Hendrickson, *AJPh* 27 (1906), 198–9.

[14] A passage in the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, in which Faustulus the herdsman gives the twin infants Romulus and Remus to his wife Acca Larentia (*OGR* 20.3), has been attributed to Fannius by G. Puccioni (*AATC* 24 (1959–60), 269–72). The MSS have *annius* or *aennius*, which is usually emended to Ennius, we think rightly. See Ennius, *Annals* 65–8 Skutsch, with comm. ad loc.; Richard, *OGR* 173–4, and note the commentary on Vennonius 13 F1, Cato 5 F16, Macer 27 F2).

[15] 'Early historians', 14.

contemporary Sempronius Asellio (no. 20). This development is rightly seen as an innovation of the Gracchan age arising from political conditions. The influence of Polybius is often stressed, and is highly probable. It is likely enough that, like Asellio, Fannius had known Polybius personally, since he was a member of Scipio's entourage at Carthage (T5, F4), and evidently shared the philosophical interests of Scipio and his friends. Incidentally this has no bearing on the 'Fanniusfrage', since the two Fannii were cousins and were probably both connected with Scipio and his circle.

The 'Fanniusfrage' has nonetheless been brought into discussions of the character of the work. As consul in 122 Fannius turned against C. Gracchus, who had supported his candidature and helped him obtain the office (Plut. *CG* 8.1–2); in particular he vigorously opposed Gracchus' citizenship law and contributed strongly to the failure not only of the law, but of the entire Gracchan project (Plut. *CG* 12.2–4; *ORF*[4] 142–4). If this Fannius was the historian, as the Mommsen–Münzer theory maintains, then it is arguable that he allowed his anti-Gracchan views to colour his presentation of events. Kornemann, for instance, suggested that it was Fannius who laid the foundation of the 'optimate' tradition of hostility to the Gracchi; many others have taken the same line, including Badian.[16] This interpretation is doubly problematic: first because it is not certain that Fannius was a committed optimate, even at the end,[17] and secondly because it would not necessarily follow that he wrote a partisan history. There is also the fact that Sallust singled out Fannius' work as an example of truthfulness (T6), which would be surprising if it was tendentiously anti-Gracchan, although Badian finds evidence here of Sallust's generosity 'in appreciation of historians with whom he disagreed'.[18] But the main problem with this interpretation is that Cicero did not recognize the author of the history as Fannius the anti-Gracchan consul of 122. This must mean either that they were in fact different people (which we think is the probable answer), or that the ex-consul was so self-effacing in his *Annals* that his identity was not evident (in which case any strong political interpretation of the work's nature and purpose can be ruled out).

The same arguments must apply in reverse if the Mommsen–Münzer thesis is rejected. If the historian is identified not with C. Fannius M.f., the consul of 122, but with his cousin, C. Fannius C.f., it does not follow that he took a pro-Gracchan line, although this has been advocated by some; Rosenberg and Bardon, for instance, believe that the 'democratic' tradition favourable to the Gracchi, evident especially in Plutarch, was initiated by Fannius, and that Sallust commended his work as truthful because it coincided with his own view of the period (as expressed for instance in *Jug.* 41–3).[19] But actually we know nothing of the political sympathies of C. Fannius

[16] Kornemann, *Gesch. der Gracchenzeit* (1903), 20–37; Badian, 'Early historians', 14.

[17] Plutarch (*CG* 12.2) says that Fannius was persuaded to oppose Gracchus under pressure from the senate, which might indicate weakness and indecision rather than resolute conviction. Thus e.g. Münzer, *RE* 6. 1989; Peter 1[2]. cxcviii n. 1. It may be that his supposed volte-face has also been exaggerated. Plutarch's account of his election (*CG* 8.2; 11.4) could be taken to mean that Gracchus backed him for the consulship not because he was a committed ally, but simply in order to prevent the election of his enemy Opimius. Thus Gruen, *Roman Politics*, 93; Cassola, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 91.

[18] Badian, 'Early historians', 15.

[19] Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 170; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 106–7.

C.f., and even if we did we would not be entitled to impose them on the history. The fragments give no firm indication that the work had a strong political slant in any direction (see comm. on F1, F4, F6);[20] this essentially negative assessment of the direct evidence remains the same, whoever the author.

Like Cato Fannius included genuine speeches (T2; Gratwick's assertion[21] that they were fictitious overlooks the implications of this text). Cicero comments on its austere style (T1, T3), and Sallust praised its veracity (T6).

(TJC)

[20] Càssola (*Vichiana* 12 (1983), 91) rightly notes that the fragments give no clear indication of the work's political slant, if any. The fact that it included Metellus Macedonicus' speech against Ti. Gracchus does not make the author an anti-Gracchan, as Badian thinks ('Early historians', 14); as Càssola points out, Sallust cannot be called anti-Roman because he included a letter of Mithridates, or a Catilinarian because he inserted speeches and a letter of Catiline.

[21] A. S. Gratwick in *CHCL* 2.1 (1982), 151.

13

Vennonius

Editions: Peter 1^2. cc, 142; Chassignet 2. xl–xli, 48–9.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 198; H. Gundel, 'Vennonius (1)', *RE* 8A (1955), 790; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 430.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Almost nothing is known of Vennonius, and little can be conjectured. Cicero's reference to his history in a letter of 46 or 45 BC (T2) gives a *terminus ante quem*, but it is generally supposed on the basis of T1 that he belonged to the later second century BC and wrote in Latin: Cicero mentions Vennonius in the sequence Fabius, Cato, Piso, Fannius, and Vennonius, then Antipater, Gellius, Clodius, Asellio, and Macer; this sequence, if roughly chronological, makes him a contemporary of Fannius and Antipater, i.e. late second century BC.[1] We do not know his *praenomen*, and he is one of only four Vennonii known from the republican period. The others were all active in the first century BC,[2] and none can be plausibly identified with the historian.

Work

The survival of just two fragments (and one of these from *OGR*) suggests that Vennonius had little impact on subsequent historians and later grammarians. Cicero placed his work stylistically on a par with so many other unaccomplished prose stylists (T1), yet complained at Tusculum in 46 or 45 of not having access to a copy (T2). If T2 is to be dated to 30 May 45, Cicero's apparent need would suggest that Vennonius' history went down at least to 146, since that was the dramatic date of

[1] Gundel, *RE* 8A, 790; Schanz–Hosius 1^4. 198; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 108. Badian ('Early historians', 34 n. 85) claims that 'Peter has him out of order' (Peter's order is: Piso, Fannius, Vennonius, Tuditanus, Gellius, Antipater, Asellio), and chooses instead to bracket him with the 'Sullans' because of his presumed lower social position (18: 'Annalists are now lesser names: a Vennonius, a Claudius Quadrigarius, a Valerius Antias').

[2] They are: Sextus Vennonius, a crony of Verres, who profited at the expense of the town of Amestratus (Cic. *Verr.* 2.89); C. Vennonius, *negotiator* and *familiaris* of Cicero (Cic. *Att.* 6.1.25, cf. 6.3.5); and Vennonius Vindicius, one of many former owners of L. Cornelius Balbus' Tusculan villa (Cic. *Balb.* 56). See Gundel, *RE* 8A. 790–1.

the political dialogue Cicero was considering at the time.[3] F2 shows that Vennonius' work went back to the kings, and F1, if it is to be relied upon, that it included the foundation.

(SJN)

[3] For the redating of T2 see Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 5. 300–1, ad loc. (no. 239). Shackleton Bailey rightly deduces that Vennonius would have been one of the historians Cicero wanted to consult for the background to his dialogue set in 146 BC. The others were Libo (36 F1) and Fannius in Brutus' epitome (12 T4). For Cicero's *πολιτικὸς σύλλογος*, under consideration in late May/early June 45, see *Att.* 13.4; 13.5; 13.6; 13.30; 13.32; 13.33.

14

Cn. Gellius

Editions: Peter I^2. cciv–ccx; 148–57; Chassignet 2. xlix–liv, 71–83, 150–9; Beck–Walter 1. 349–67.

Principal discussions: K. Nipperdey, 'Zur Geschichte der römischen Historiographie. 1. Cn. Gellius', *Philologus* 6 (1851), 131–4 (=*Opuscula* (1877), 399–403); O. Meltzer, 'Gnaeus Gellius', *NJPhP* 105 (1872), 429–32; Münzer, 'Gellius (4)', *RE* 7 (1910), 998–1000; Leo, *GRL* (1913), 331–2; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 131–3; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 197–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 77–80; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2 (1966), 87–93; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 11–12; Rawson, 'The first Latin annalists', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 689–717, esp. 713–17 (=*Roman Culture* (1991), 267–71); T. P. Wiseman, 'Cicero, *de diuinatione* i.55', *CQ* 29 (1979), 142–4; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), 11; 20–3; M. Chassignet, 'L'Annaliste Cn. Gellius ou l'heurématologie au service de l'histoire', *Klèma* 24 (1999), 85–91; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 429–30; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 29–30.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The only Gellius to appear in the historical record[1] before the *monetalis* of T5 and the historian is the man whose opponent in a civil case was supported by Cato (T6); all three have the *praenomen* Gnaeus. F30 shows that Gellius was (still) writing after 146,[2] and T1 indicates that Cicero regarded him as preceding Coelius Antipater,[3] who, we argue later, may have been writing about 110.[4] If the known Gellii are linked in any

[1] The next is the consul of 72, L. Gellius Publicola, the first example of the *cognomen* since the fourth century; it had previously been confined to the Valerii.

[2] No weight can be put on Censorinus' apparent implication that Piso and Gellius, unlike Hemina, were not alive in 146: Piso was a tribune of the plebs in 149, and later became consul (133) and censor (120).

[3] Wiseman (*CQ* 29 (1979), 242–4), holding that Gellius was a contemporary of Coelius, writing part of his work before, part after that of Coelius, argues in favour of V^2's *maxime* for *proxi(u)me* (clearly a conjecture: V^2 lacks authority; Wiseman gives the impression, though, that he had arrived at the conjecture before discovering that it stood in V^2) in T1. His principal argument is that Cicero could not have said that all historians had the story of the peasant's dream if the most recent had been Coelius: given the fact that the sentence contains the vague generalizing plurals discussed below, it is perfectly natural for Cicero to have said *omnes* when he meant 'lots of' (just as in English we say, e.g. 'everyone knows', without meaning to deny that there are people who do not).

Wiseman also argues (art. cit. 242; *Clio's Cosmetics*, 11, following Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria', 161) that Gellius' denial that Numa had four sons was a reaction to the version of Piso, whose family claimed descent from one of them (see commentary on F22). While it is indeed likely that Piso did have this version, it is not specifically attributed to him, and Dionysius, in citing Gellius, says that most authors had the alternative version.

There is no reason to alter *belli* at Cic. *leg.* 1.6 (=GT2) to *Gellius* with Passerat (Gulielmus' *Gellii* was based on the belief, discussed below, that there was more than one historian called Gellius).

[4] See I. 257.

way, the most plausible hypothesis would be that the historian is identical with the *monetalis* and that the Gellius in the speech of Cato was his father.[5] *Gellius* is attested as a Samnite name (both *praenomen* and *nomen*) at the time of the Second and Third Samnite Wars (Diod. 20.90.4, Livy 9.44.13, 10.18–19) and it is possible that the second-century Gellii were of Samnite origin.[6]

In T1 and T2 the name of Gellius appears in the plural, and this, together with *Sextus Gellius* in F19 and *Agellius* in F37, has led some[7] to believe that more than one Gellius wrote history. In fact both T1 and T2 are examples of the usage, found in both Greek and Latin (though much more commonly in the latter), where the plural with a personal name means 'people like . . . '.[8] As to F19 and 37, *Sextus* is to be regarded as either a corruption or an error by the author of the *OGR*, while *Agellius* should probably be emended to *Asellio*.[9]

Work

The most striking thing about Gellius' work is its length. F10 and 11 are cited by Charisius, according to the Naples MS, from book 97.[10] The excerpts of Cuyck[11] have *xxvii*, but corruption from *xc* to *xx* is considerably more likely than the reverse. Münzer[12] argued that the high book number was invented by a grammarian, to exaggerate the extent of his reading.[13] The number is, however, consistent with the evidence of other citations. F8, from book 15, belongs to 389 BC, a year dealt with by Livy at the beginning of book 6. In F9 an event of 216 is cited from book 33;[14] by that time Livy had only reached book 23. Let us suppose, purely for the sake of argument, that Gellius continued his history to 130 BC. By the time he reached that date, Livy had completed fifty-nine books, thirty-seven of them on the period since 216. Gellius would have covered this same period in sixty-five books. This is perfectly credible, especially as it is quite likely that Gellius, as Livy himself was to do, wrote at greater proportional length when narrating the events of his own time (and he may, of course, have continued later than 130).

As long as it was believed that the eighty-book version of the pontifical annals was published by P. Mucius Scaevola, it could be argued that their existence was, in part at

[5] Thus Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 267–8, followed by Chassignet (I) and Beck–Walter (347 n. 2). Münzer (*RE* 7 (1910), 998; also R. J. Evans, *LCM* 5 (1980), 201–3) identified all three Gellii, while Badian ('Early historians', 31 n. 50) identified the historian with Cato's opponent, making the *monetalis* his son.

[6] Cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 269–70. But Gellius' interest in Italian peoples (see below) is not an argument for Italian origins; it is sufficiently explained by the example of Cato, even if Gellius developed it in a very different way.

[7] Cf. n. 3 and Peter cciv n. 1; the most recent instance is Richard (see comm. on F9).

[8] See introduction to Fabius (1), I. 164 n. 17; cf. I. 228 n. 5, 363.

[9] See comm. ad locc.

[10] Both fragments come from the same passage of Charisius and were treated as a single fragment by Peter; there is no question of the numeral occurring twice.

[11] Cf. Rouse in *Texts and Transmission*, 52.

[12] *Hermes*, 32 (1897), 472.

[13] He did not argue that it was corrupt, as Rawson (*Roman Culture*, 268) states. Earlier Malxner (*ZöG* 29 (1878), 332–4) had proposed xlvii. Chassignet prints xxvii, while Beck–Walter have xlvii in F10 and xxvii in F11 (F30 and 31 in their edition, in that order!).

[14] For the book number see comm. ad loc.

least, the explanation of the scale of Gellius' treatment.[15] With that view abandoned,[16] Gellius must be credited with expansion, and perhaps invention, on a huge scale. Only F4 demonstrably comes from a speech, but it is quite likely that speeches provided a good proportion of the additional material.

Only ten of the thirty-six certain[17] fragments are attributed to books. Peter assigned F12–18 to book 1, and it is indeed more likely that the fragments concerning inventions (F12–15) and mythological figures (F16–19) came at the beginning of Gellius' work, rather than as digressions at different points in the narrative; we have, nevertheless, placed them (including F19, from the *OGR* and therefore omitted by Peter) in the 'fragments not assigned to books' section, with an indication that they probably come from book 1. We have similarly indicated that F20 probably comes from book 2, since Gellius is likely to have discussed the origin of the Sabines at the beginning of his account of the rape of the Sabine women. We have, however, made F31, which Peter placed first, holding that it came from Gellius' preface, an unassignable fragment, for reasons given in the commentary.

F2 and 3 are assigned to book 2, F4 and 5 to book 3; it is reasonable to assume that F1, Gellius' dating of the rape, also belongs to book 2.

Peter had no authority for assigning F21–3 (reigns of Numa and Ancus Marcius) to book 3 or F24–6 (events of 496, 492, and 490) to book 4. F8 (389) is attributed to book 15, and Peter placed F27 in the same book, and before it. It is, in fact, likely that it refers to an event later than 389,[18] and it could have stood in a book later than 15.

We argue in the commentary that F28, which Peter regarded as unattributable, belongs to the First Punic War, probably to 250 BC. Peter appears to place F29 and 30 (161 and 146 respectively) in book 33, together with F9, which is cited from that book, but he doubtless intended merely to indicate that they come from a book later than 33 and earlier than 97.

The contexts of F32–6, all cited for linguistic reasons, cannot be determined.

The fact that the Sabine rape and its aftermath were split between books 2 and 3 indicates that book 1 was devoted largely, if not entirely, to matters preceding the foundation of Rome. F12–15, all from the elder Pliny, are concerned with the theme of the *πρῶτος εὑρετής* ('first inventor'), and that theme is also evident in F16 (augury) and 17 (medicine). It is present in Cassius Hemina,[19] but only in relation to Roman matters, and it looks as if Gellius extended it to include inventions of general application.[20] Hemina's influence may also be detectable in the implausible Greek name given to a (lost) Italian town.[21] But the only clear example of euhemerism, a feature of Hemina,[22] in the fragments is the treatment of Angitia in F18.[23]

[15] Thus Leeman, *Orationis Ratio*, 81, Badian, 'Early historians', 12; cf. I. 156. Badian's statement 'Gellius cannot have started his work after their publication; but he clearly had access to them . . .' is a consequence of his view (see n. 5) that the historian was identical with the Gellius of Cato's speech.

[16] See I. 151–6.

[17] Excluding F37 (see above) and F38 (see comm. on Coelius 15 F64).

[18] See comm. ad loc.

[19] See I. 223.

[20] On the fragments concerning inventions see particularly Chassignet, *Ktèma*, 24 (1999), 85–91.

[21] See F16, and cf. Hemina 6 F4–5 with comm.

[22] See I. 223.

[23] See comm. on F14.

F16–18 are striking for their fusion of Greek and Italian mythological figures in an Italian context and so too, in F16, is the presentation of Cacus as a significant player in Italian history, not a mere cattle-thief. Much of this may be of Gellius' own devising, and the same may be the case with the attributions of inventions in F12–14, though he was not the first to credit Palamedes with the invention of weights and measures.[24]

Heterodox statements continue to occur in fragments of Gellius' narrative of Roman history. He claimed that Numa modelled the *fetiales* on an institution of Ardea (F21), denied the existence of sons of that king (F22),[25] and appears to have had a unique date for the foundation of Rome.[26] He gave spuriously precise dates for events in the regal period (F1, 23), a practice, no doubt, which formed part of a detailed and circumstantial account of the kings.

If the introduction of the name of Gellius into *leg.* 1.6 is rejected,[27] the only reference to him in Cicero is T1 = F26, and Cicero may merely have found a statement in Coelius to the effect that the story that followed had also been told by Fabius and Gellius. It is thus probable that Varro, to whom Pliny perhaps owes some of his citations on the πρῶτος εὑρετής theme,[28] was the first writer to make use of him in any detail.[29]

For Gellius' language and style see General Introduction, I. 26–7.

(JB)

[24] See comm. on F15.

[25] For the reasons for this see comm. on F16–17.

[26] See comm. on F29.

[27] Cf. I. 252 n. 3.

[28] Cf. Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 376–7 n. 1; but see General Introduction, I. 102–3.

[29] The fact that Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites Gellius and Licinius Macer together in F23–5 (in F23 for their disagreement, in F24 and 25 their agreement) does not justify Peter's suspicion (ccx) that in these passages Dionysius consulted only Macer: in F1, 21, and 22 there is no reference to Macer, and Peter does not attempt to argue that Dionysius took these references from him.

15

L. Coelius Antipater

Editions: Peter 1[2]. ccxi–ccxxxvii, 158–77; W. Herrmann, *Die Historien des Coelius Antipater* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1979); A. Sparti, 'Celio Antipatro in Nonio', *Studi Noniani* 7 (1982), 247–78 (only fragments preserved by Nonius); Chassignet 2. xli–xlix, 50–70, 134–50; Beck–Walter 1. 242–5.

Principal discussions: B. A. Nauta, 'De L. Coelio Antipatro historico belli Punici secundi', *Annales academiae Lugduni Batauorum* 6 (1820–1); G. Groen van Prinsterer, 'Disputatio de L. Coelio Antipatro historico belli Punici secundi', ibid.; O. Meltzer, *de L. Coelio Antipatro belli Punici secundi scriptore* (Leipzig, 1867; *non uidimus*); E. Wölfflin, *Antiochos von Syrakus und Coelius Antipater* (Winterthur, 1872); O. Gilbert, 'Die Fragmente des L. Coelius Antipater', *JbKPh*, Suppbd. 10 (1878–9), 365–470; W. Sieglin, 'Die Fragmente des L. Coelius Antipater', *JbKPh*, Suppbd. 11 (1880), 1–92; G. F. Unger, O. Gilbert, R. Pöhlmann, *Philologischer Anzeiger* 10 (1879–80), 384–400; G. F. Unger, 'Zu Coelius Antipater', *Philologus* 40 (1881), 183–6; Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*[2], 1. 176–7; P. Gensel, 'Coelius(7)', *RE* 4 (1900), 185–94; U. Kahrstedt, *Geschichte der Karthager von 218–146* (Berlin, 1913), esp. 143–362; Leo, *GRL* (1913), 336–41; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 167–9; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 200–2; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 15–17, 32–3; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 217–23; A. La Penna, 'Polemiche sui sogni nella storiografia latina arcaica', *StudUrb (B)* 49 (1975), 1, 49–60; (reviews of Herrmann (see under *Editions*): S. Borzsak, *Gymnasium* 87 (1980), 545–7; J. Briscoe, *CR* 30 (1980), 208–10; H.A. Gärtner, *Gnomon* 53 (1981), 117–20; M. Borioni, *BSL* 13 (1983), 31–9; W. A. Schröder, *AAHG* 39 (1986), 57–61); J. Seibert, *Forschungen zu Hannibal* (Darmstadt, 1993); U. Händl-Sagawe, *Der Beginn des 2. punischen Krieges* (Munich, 1995); Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 430–5; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 35–8.

INTRODUCTION

Life

We know of no public office held by L. Coelius[1] Antipater,[2] and his dates must be deduced from the evidence of the testimonia and fragments. Everything points to his having written in the last third of the second century BC. The most specific statement

[1] *Coelius* and *Caelius* are different *gentilicia*, not merely alternative spellings. The name is, however, frequently corrupted to *Caelius* (in Renaissance MSS both *ae* and *oe* regularly appear simply as *e*) or *Caecilius* (cf. commentary on F37–8 and 55). Except in cases where the identity of the person concerned is in doubt, we print *Coelius* and do not refer to manuscript readings in the *apparatus*.

[2] Peter (ccviii) rightly dismissed the notion that the *cognomen* was a sign of servile origin, and Gensel's suggestion (*RE* 4. 185) that he was the son of a freedman is no more plausible. It is parallel to the adoption of *Philippus* by the Marcii (cf. Briscoe, *Gerión* 2 (1984), 151–3). Perhaps the historian's father had dealings with Antipater, the cousin of Antiochus III, during the negotiations following the battle of Magnesia (Livy 37.45.5; cf. Briscoe's note on 37.41.1)

(T2) is that he was a contemporary of Fannius.[3] Consistently with that, T1 and T3 are preceded by mention of Piso.[4] He was a friend and teacher—i.e. an older contemporary—of L. Crassus (cos. 95) (T3), and a pupil (in the law) of M'. Manilius (cos. 149), P. Mucius Scaevola (cos. 133), and M. Junius Brutus, son of the consul of 178 (T8). F49 shows that he was writing or, at least, had still not finished his history after the death of Gaius Gracchus in 121. If Piso did not begin his history until after his censorship,[5] Coelius was perhaps writing about 110; at all events, his work was complete by 91, the dramatic date of the *De oratore* (T1). If, with Peter,[6] we place his birth around 170, his dedicatee, the Stoic L. Aelius Stilo, who is usually regarded as having been born *c.*150, was a younger man.[7]

Cichorius[8] identified the historian with the Caelius of *uidere non uult Caelium Panaetius* ('Panaetius does not want to see Caelius'), quoted by Rufinus *GL* 6.562, which he regarded as a line of Lucilius,[9] and *rhet. Her.* 2.19 *Caelius iudex absoluit iniuriarum eum qui Lucilium poetam in scaena nominatim laeserat* ('Caelius as a judge acquitted on a charge of slander the man who had insulted by name the poet Lucilius on the stage'), and interpreted them to mean that Coelius' action in acquitting the actor who had insulted Lucilius on stage led to a quarrel between Coelius and his erstwhile friend Panaetius. While Coelius' dedication to Stilo makes it likely enough that he was a friend of Panaetius, Cichorius' reconstruction is extremely speculative,[10] and we do not include the two passages as testimonia.

Cicero (T1) thought his oratorical ability limited, but his opinion of Coelius' legal knowledge (T3) was higher than that of Pomponius (T8).

Work

Coelius departed from the model set by his predecessors in deciding to write the history of a limited period, that of the Hannibalic War. Fragments dealing with an earlier (F48, 57, 61)[11] or later (F49, 50) period are easily seen as digressions, particularly concerning places mentioned in his narrative—Cato will have been influential here—and there is no case for positing the existence of a second work dealing with Roman history from the foundation to his own time.[12] Nonius, who preserves twelve fragments, cites seven of them (F4, 17, 30, 38, 40, 41, 43) as being

[3] On the dates of Fannius see I. 244–7.

[4] As Peter stressed (ccxii), there is no significance in the fact that the mention of Piso in *Brutus* 106 (=Piso 9 T3) comes after T3, since the former is merely a parenthesis referring to Piso's responsibility for the first *repetundae* ('extortion') law.

[5] See I. 234.

[6] p. ccxii.

[7] On Stilo see Goetz, *RE* 1 (1893), 532–3. Agustin (see I. 654) emended the transmitted *Laelio* in F1 to *L. Aelio* (Chassignet, xliv, strangely attributes the error to Cicero himself), but it was not until 1882 that F46 was correctly attributed to Coelius (see comm. ad loc.).

[8] *Untersuch. Lucilius*, 59–60; id. *RS* 75–7.

[9] = Lucilius 945, ed. W. Krenkel (Leiden, 1970).

[10] Equally speculative is his notion (*Untersuch. Lucilius*, 5 n. 3) that the historian was the brother of the C. Coelius of the *s.c. de agro Pergameno* (Sherk, *RDGE* 12); Badian ('Early historians', 16) states this as fact, though at 32 n. 65 he gets the matter right.

[11] Not counting F2, which deals with events preceding but closely related to the war.

[12] The view first put forward by Meursius in 1597, and argued for in detail by Sieglin ('Die Fragmente' (1880)).

annali lib.,[13] with a book number following, to which may be added F28, where *annali* (Peter) is a much more plausible emendation of the impossible *annalis* than Junius' *annalium*.[14] Two appear as *annalium lib.* (F6), and *lib.* preceded by *Antipater* (F44), respectively, both with a number. F54 has the corrupt *anaui*, while F55 is merely ascribed to Coelius.[15] All other sources who give a title use *historiae*.[16] Obviously nothing can be deduced from all this; Cicero (F1), our earliest evidence, refers to the *prooemium belli Punici*, and Peter[17] may have been right to suggest that the title was *belli Punici alterius libri*.[18] Peter's additional suggestion that the title included the name of the dedicatee is unlikely.

Coelius, like other historians of the Hannibalic War, will have written about its origins and outbreak. F2 refers to Hasdrubal having been sent to Spain when Hamilcar was in command, and F7 preserves the form Coelius used for the genitive plural of the ethnic of Saguntum. Fragments of books 1–7 are preserved, and since book 7 dealt with the events of 203–1,[19] it can safely be assumed that there were no more than seven.

In 1870 Peter assigned the fragments whose context is certain (many are from Livy) or which he regarded as probable, but which are cited without book number, to individual books without argument, but clearly on the basis of the proximity of their context to that of fragments which are cited with a book number.[20] In the years that followed Gilbert,[21] Sieglin,[22] and Unger[23] put forward other schemes, but in his edition of 1914 Peter, again without argument, merely repeated his previous arrangement. Herrmann accepted Peter's assignations uncritically, while Chassignet and Beck–Walter do not indicate book divisions in their texts.

The following attempts a fresh assessment. It does so without altering transmitted book numbers except in the one case where, we believe, there are very strong reasons for doing so, or, we hope, either refusing to accept the most plausible context for a particular fragment or maintaining a particular context despite the consequences of so doing.[24] Much depends on decisions concerning F28 and F53.

[13] In the text we print *libro* in full and (apart from F7; cf. n. 48) do not indicate MSS abbreviations in the *apparatus*.

[14] Junius also printed *annalium* at F38, 40, and 43, as did Lucien Müller on each occasion (cf. General Introduction, I. 95 (on Nonius)).

[15] On the reading in F44, 54, and 55 see comm. ad locc.

[16] In the text we print *historiarum* in full, and do not report manuscript abbreviations in the *apparatus*.

[17] p. ccxv.

[18] It is not totally clear whether by 'quae uerba u. *alterius* supplenda esse . . . ' Peter meant that *alterius* was part of the title or was to be understood. But Coelius must have indicated which Punic war he was writing about, *pace* Herrmann (45), who thinks that the title could have been *belli Punici annales* or *belli Punici historiae*.

[19] See I. 260.

[20] Previously only Groen van Prinsterer and Roth had assigned such fragments to specific books.

[21] 'Die Fragmente' (1878–9), 368–78.

[22] 'Die Fragmente' (1880), 45–53.

[23] *Philologus* 40 (1881), 183–6.

[24] Thus Nauta believed that F34 referred to Otacilius (cf. Livy 24.8.13–16 and comm. ad loc.), with the consequence that Coelius had reached book 5 by the year 214. Unger, who wanted book 2 to contain the whole of 216, emended the book number in F16 to *ii* and refused to believe that F17 referred to the thanks offered to Varro after Cannae (*Philologus* 40 (1881), 184 and n. 1). Sieglin (followed by Unger) held that F33 belonged to Coelius' account of the Roman capture of Tarentum in 209, entailing that book 5 began in that year, and had therefore to believe that F28 does not belong to the account of the battle of the Metaurus. In F44 Sieglin altered *vi* to the *iiii* of F (admittedly, he could not know that F lacked authority).

Book 1 contained the events preceding the outbreak of war (F2 refers to Hasdrubal), together with those from 218 to the battle of Cannae in 216. The aftermath of the battle seems to have been split between books 1 and 2, since F17, from book 1, refers to the vote of thanks to Varro on his return to Rome, while F22, which concerns the conversation between Maharbal and Hannibal immediately after the battle, is cited from book 2.

No such certainty can be reached concerning books 2–4. We turn first to F53. Gellius says that a friend of his had asked for his opinion on the question whether, when talking about a man who was holding the consulship for the third or fourth time, one should say *tertium* and *quartum* or *tertio* and *quarto*, and had added that he had heard a learned man at Rome use the latter forms, and that Coelius had written thus at the beginning of a book—Gellius clearly gave the number of the book, but it has been lost. Now the only year during the Hannibalic War when one consul was holding office for the third time and the other for the fourth was 214, when the consuls were Q. Fabius Maximus IV and M. Claudius Marcellus III. Since, as we have seen, book 2 began with the aftermath of the battle of Cannae (late June, 216), only book 3 could have begun with the entry into office of the consuls of 214. But this has the consequence, not perhaps totally impossible but certainly surprising, that while the first book contained the action-packed first two and a half years of the war—including the events preceding the declaration of war, Hannibal's march to Italy, and the three major Roman defeats at the Trebia, Trasimene, and Cannae, book 2 covered only a year and a half—i.e. the rest of 216 and all of 215.

But the consequence is not inevitable. It may be that Gellius (or his friend) meant not that *tertio* and *quarto* occurred together at the beginning of a certain book, but that he used one of these forms,[25] or indeed some other numeric adverb in *-io*.[26] If that is so, a number of possibilities present themselves: the reference could be to the third consulship of Q. Fulvius Flaccus in 212, the fourth of Marcellus in 210, the fourth of Fulvius and/or the fifth of Fabius in 209, or the fifth of Marcellus in 208. We postpone for the moment consideration of the book which might have begun with one of these possibilities, and which, if any, of them can be excluded.

Crucial to this consideration is F28, which, as argued in the commentary, must come from Coelius' account of the battle of the Metaurus in 207. The fragment is cited by Nonius, and the book number appears as *iii* in the manuscripts of the first and second families, but as *iiii* in the extract family.[27] Strictly speaking, the agreement of LG eliminates *iiii*, and such a corruption is very easy. If, however, the battle of the Metaurus occurred in book 3, it follows that since books 2 and 3 occupied the whole period from Cannae to the Metaurus, and book 6 contained Scipio's invasion of Africa in 204 (see below), only the period from the Metaurus (late June, 207) to the end of 205 remains for books 4 and 5—and 206 was not a year when a great deal took place. Herrmann,[28] holding, implausibly, that F29 refers to an episode in Spain in 206,

[25] Thus Nauta, 'De L. Coelio' (1820), 20.

[26] Thus Gilbert, 'Die Fragmente' (1878–9), 376.

[27] On the manuscripts of Nonius see Lindsay's edition, xix–xxxiv; and General Introduction, I. 95–6.

[28] 172. See comm. on F29.

solved the problem by the assumption that Coelius devoted book 4 to non-Italian, particularly Spanish, events since the beginning of the war. It is most unlikely that Coelius departed from annalistic order in this way,[29] and it is a mere accident of transmission that no fragment of books 1–3 refers to the war outside Italy. In these circumstances, there is a strong case for adopting the reading of the extract family—independent corruption in the first and second families is quite possible.[30] This allows a more even distribution of material between books 2, 3, and 4, and it can be said with some confidence that 214 (and, of course, 215) was treated in book 2, 211 in book 3, and 208 in book 4; F25 and 27 are therefore assigned to books 3 and 4 respectively, and if F 60 refers to 214, and F52 to 215 (see commentary ad locc.), they would belong to book 2. Whether book 3 began in 213 or 212 remains uncertain—though the latter is more likely; in that case F58, if correctly identified as referring to an event of 213, would belong to book 2 rather than book 3. Book 4 is most likely to have begun in 209; if it had begun in 210, books 2 and 3 would have contained the events from Cannae until 211, book 4 those from the beginning of 210 to, at the earliest, the battle of the Metaurus; if in 208, books 2 and 3 would have covered the period from Cannae until the end of 209, books 4 and 5 only 208–205.[31]

We can now return to F53. The likelihood is that Coelius was referring either to Q. Fulvius Flaccus in 212 or to Fulvius and Fabius in 209.

F38, from book 6, clearly refers to Scipio's invasion of Africa in 204, and the other two fragments dealing with it (F36–7) can also be safely assigned to that book, as can F39, from an episode early in the African campaign. It may be that it also contained part of 205. For book 5, then, we have, at most, the period from the Metaurus to the beginning of 204; two of the fragments cited from this book (F30, 33) can be given a plausible context in this period, and F31–2 can therefore also be assigned to it. All the fragments cited from book 7 (F41–5[32]) can be given a context in the years 203–201, and F54, which we are inclined to assign to the campaign of 203, may also have been cited with that book number. It is likely that Coelius ended his work, as Livy ended his third decade, with the peace treaty between Rome and Carthage and the triumph of Scipio.

If these arguments are correct, it follows that, while the lengths of Coelius' books may have varied, he devoted considerably more space to the final years of the war, in particular, no doubt, to the exploits of Scipio, than he did to the period between 218 and 207.

We include two fragments, F23 and 47, which are not in Peter. F63 is moved from *incertae sedis fragmenta* to 'doubtful fragments', while F65–8 remain in the latter category and are joined by F64, given a context by Peter but placed at the end because it is not specifically ascribed to Coelius.[33] Peter's F65, together with the alleged

[29] Klotz (*Livius und seine Vorgänger*, 154, 291–2) thought that Coelius did not observe a strict year-by-year division in his narrative of events in Spain.

[30] *iiii* was suggested by Briscoe (*CR* 30 (1980), 209), at the time knowing nothing of the manuscript evidence.

[31] Beck–Walter (37–8) assert, without argument, that book 2 continued until Hannibal's march on Rome, book 3 dealt with events in the Italian theatre, book 4 with events in Spain after the deaths of the Scipios, and book 5 with the final engagements in Italy.

[32] On the reading in F41 see comm. ad loc.

[33] For justification of the placing of all these fragments see comm. ad locc.

fragments which he discusses on pp. ccxxxv–ccxxxvii, are, with the exception of F47, excluded for the reasons he gives.[34] Peter's F67 is also excluded: there is no reason at all to identify Coelius with the author of a *uetus historia rerum Poenicarum*.

Coelius was indubitably one of Livy's major sources for the war, and in the heyday of *Quellenkritik* much effort was devoted to attempting to define those parts of Livy's third decade that derive from Coelius.[35] Nissen[36] had shown that it was possible to identify those passages of books 31–45 which derived from Polybius and those which did not. His successors thought that they could similarly attribute sources to both the non-Polybian sections of the fourth and fifth decades and the other surviving parts of Livy's work. Though there is no detailed recent treatment of the third decade,[37] the modern consensus is that such a view is hopelessly schematic and optimistic:[38] all that can safely be ascribed to Coelius is what Livy himself specifically so ascribes. The commentary on fragments preserved by Livy eschews speculation about the source(s) of the surrounding material.

With regard to Coelius' own sources, there is no reason to doubt that he used his predecessors, particularly Silenus of Caleacte, who wrote from the Carthaginian point of view, Fabius Pictor, and Polybius. Peter[39] excluded Polybius, mainly, it seems, because he thought that a writer who so sensationalized history would not follow one who was so opposed to sensationalism (see below). Coelius would not, however, have ignored Cincius Alimentus, Acilius, Cato,[40] Hemina, and Piso. Once again, however, we can be more specific only if our evidence names Coelius' source, or a conflict between Coelius and a particular writer enables a negative conclusion to be drawn (cf. F12, where we can be certain that Polybius was not Coelius' source).

Only in the case of Silenus do we have explicit evidence. In F8 Cicero says that Coelius was following Silenus in his account of Hannibal's dream after the capture of Saguntum, in which Jupiter gave him a god as a guide in his march on Italy; Coelius himself will have acknowledged Silenus as his source. It is not certain, however, that Silenus is among the writers criticised by Polybius (3.47.8–9) for making a god or hero

[34] Quint. *inst.* 1.56.1 belongs to M. Caelius Rufus, Sol. 1.8, 2.28 and Flavius Caper *GL* 7.100 to Cn. Gellius (14 F6, 7, 18); Nonius takes 87M=123L., 113M=162L., 129M=188L., 405M=652L. from Aulus Gellius, who ascribes them to Claudius Quadrigarius (24 F24, 23, 21, 12 respectively). The Antipater of Pliny *nat.* 8.11 is a Greek, the name of Coelius is a conjecture in Strabo 230 (=Acilius 7 F7), Charis. 176, Festus 150 (=Alfius 69 F1), and Arnob. 3.40, while at Prisc. *GL* 2.382 the best MSS have *melius*.

[35] For bibliography from the 1860s and 1870s see Gilbert, 'Die Fragmente' (1878–9), 365.

[36] Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen*.

[37] See the sceptical survey by Seibert, *Forschungen zu Hannibal* (1993), 44–51, with bibliography on 52. Disagreement centres on the question whether, and if so to what extent, Livy used Polybius directly in the third decade. Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios*, 193–241, denied any such use (his position on the citation of a variant from Polybius at 30.45.5 is not clear), attributing similarities between Livy and Polybius to derivation, via Coelius for Livy, from a common source, or, in the case of the First Macedonian War, by Coelius himself using Polybius. Others are willing to allow the possibility of consultation of Polybius by Livy throughout the decade: see I. 86. See Walsh's edition of book 21 (London, 1973), 39; Briscoe, *CR* 28 (1978), 267–9; *OCD*[4] s.v. Livy.

[38] For books 6–10, see Oakley, in J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.), *Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 439–60, replacing *Comm.* 1. 13–20. For the fourth decade Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 1–12; 2. 1–3; 3. 1–2.

[39] See his stemma on p. ccxxxi. JWR suggests that Coelius may have chosen to ignore Polybius because he was not contemporary with the war.

[40] See F22, 57. For speculation concerning other fragments see Gilbert, 'Die Fragmente' (1878–9), 382–90.

guide Hannibal across the Alps.[41] It is also likely that Silenus indulged in other examples of rhetorical exaggeration, but it does not follow that he was Coelius' source whenever the latter so exaggerates (cf. F32, 36, 52[42]): at F32, a second dream of Hannibal, the opposite appears to be the case.[43]

Coelius gives the impression of sifting his sources carefully. F62 refers to those historians who tell the truth, and at F27 he is said to have reported three versions of the death of Marcellus, and claimed that his preferred version was based on his own research.

A considerable number of fragments (F3–5, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 40, 44, 45, 55, 59[44]) either certainly or possibly come from speeches. Peter[45] claimed that Coelius was the first Roman historian who is known to have followed the Greek practice of inserting invented speeches into his narrative—Cato used only his own actual (or, rather, published) ones. One can, however, point to examples of words put into the mouths of individuals in Cato (5 F78–9),[46] Hemina (6 F15),[47] Piso (9 F10), and Gellius (14 F5); and Livy reports a remark, in *oratio obliqua*, which Fabius Pictor said was often made by Coriolanus in old age (Fabius 1 F16).[48] Most of these, it is true, appear to be brief remarks, while some of the fragments of Coelius read like extracts from fully developed speeches. Even that, however, may be an accident of transmission. Knowledge of a speech depends, in practice if not in theory, entirely on verbatim citation, and there are, of course, no such citations for those who wrote in Greek. It would be surprising if Fabius Pictor, so clearly writing in the Hellenistic tradition, did not include speeches. The use of speeches perhaps enabled Coelius to present both sides of the argument at Carthage which preceded the outbreak of war, and that about the making of peace after the battle of Zama.[49]

The fragments contain four dreams—the two of Hannibal already mentioned, those of the peasant in F48 and that of Gaius Gracchus in F49. It is possible that the latter two were narrated in a digression occasioned by the first of Hannibal's dreams.[50] A tendency to paradoxography can be seen in F50 and 52.

In three fragments of book 1 (F7, 18, 19) preserved by Charisius there is a reference to linguistic comments made by Paulus. Paulus will be the poet Julius Paulus referred to on a number of occasions by Aulus Gellius, and it appears that he wrote a linguistic commentary on Coelius' first book.[51]

Brutus compiled an epitome of Coelius' work (T4). There is no need to think that Cicero used this rather than the full version.[52]

[41] Thus Peter ccxx; Walbank, *Comm.* 1. 381; K. Meister, *Maia* 23 (1971), 3–9.

[42] On F37 see comm. ad loc.

[43] See comm. ad loc.

[44] F59 reports a speech in *oratio obliqua*.

[45] p. ccxviii.

[46] See comm. on F22.

[47] For other fragments of Hemina which could be in direct speech speech cf. 1. 223.

[48] See G. Forsythe, *Livy and Early Rome* (Stuttgart, 1999), 75, who includes Cato 5 F76, which cannot be regarded as certain, since Gellius specifically says that he is not here quoting Cato verbatim, but misses Cato 5 F78–9 and does not mention Coelius at all.

[49] Cf. comm. on F3–5, 44, and 55.

[50] Cf. La Penna, *StudUrb (B)* 49 (1975), 1, 53–5. But see comm. on F48 and 49.

[51] Cf. Diehl, *RE* 10 (1917), 690; F. Della Corte, *Studi Noniani* 7 (1982), 89–96. In F7 *lib.* is thus better expanded to *librum* rather than *libro*; see also comm. on F19.

[52] Cf. La Penna, *StudUrb (B)* 49 (1975), 50.

In ordering the fragments we have assigned to specific books only those fragments that are cited with book numbers or that can (with reasonable certainty) be linked to particular events and consequently assigned to the appropriate books in accordance with our reconstruction of the architecture of the work as a whole (see above). The underlying assumption is that Coelius wrote a chronological narrative of the war in annalistic format. Consequently, when the context can be identified with reasonable certainty fragments are arranged chronologically within individual books. Fragments without book numbers that cannot be assigned to an identifiable context, or where the context is open to doubt, are grouped under 'Unassigned Fragments' and arranged in chronological order of citing authorities. Our reasoning in each case is explained as appropriate in the commentary.

(JB)

16

Paulus Clodius

Editions: Peter 1^2. ccxxxviii–ccxxxix, 178.

Principal discussions: J. G. Hulleman, *De Paulo qui fertur Claudio* (Amsterdam 1856; *non uidimus*); B. Niese, *RE* 3 (1899), 2860–1; Schanz-Hosius 1^4 (1927), 317; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 17, 20; M. H. Crawford, 'Numa and the antiquarians', *Faventia* 20 (1998), 37–8; Chassignet 3 (2004), xxiv–xxv.

INTRODUCTION

The two fragments and the lone testimonium[1] which we print involve two questions of identification. Do all, or any two, of the passages refer to the same person, and, if they do not all so refer,[2] is the writer mentioned in any of them Q. Claudius Quadrigarius?[3]

F1 might seem prima facie evidence for the author being Quadrigarius. Clodius' claim that genealogies (see comm. on F1) of noble houses were destroyed at the time of the Gallic Sack seems to echo what Livy says at the beginning of book 6: *si quae in commentariis pontificum aliisque publicis priuatisque erant monumentis, incensa urbe pleraque interiere* (6.1.2: 'if anything existed in the archives of the *pontifices* and other public and private records, it perished, for the most part, when the city was burnt'). Such a consideration would seem to be a good motive for Quadrigarius to have begun his history only in 390, and the fact that six fragments of Quadrigarius can be paralleled by passages of Livy's account of the sack in book 5 makes it plausible to think that at 6.1.2 Livy was repeating what Quadrigarius had said (see I. 289).

The objection to this is that Plutarch says quite explicitly that the title of Clodius' work was ἔλεγχος χρόνων. It is scarcely conceivable that this was Plutarch's translation of *libri annales* (as Crawford appears to think possible), and if F1 has to be explained as coming from a separate work, the parallels with Livy begin to lose their force.[4]

Identification of the Clodius of T1 with Quadrigarius is even more difficult. Cicero says that Clodius and Asellio (in that order) wrote after Coelius Antipater. Asellio served under Scipio Aemilianus at Numantia (Asellio 20 T2=F7), and his last datable fragment (20 F11) refers to 91, that of Quadrigarius (24 F88) to 82.

[1] On *belli* cf. I. 252 n. 3.

[2] Obviously the Paulus Clodius of F2 cannot be Q. Claudius Quadrigarius. Nothing follows from the different spellings of the *nomen* in the three passages.

[3] The matter has been much discussed, the majority identifying Plutarch's Clodius (T1) with Quadrigarius. For bibliography see Chassignet 3. xxiv nn. 110–11; cf. Beck–Walter 2. 109–10.

[4] Since a large number of narrative fragments are preserved from book 1 of Quadrigarius, the suggestion made below about the work of Clodius could not apply.

On the other hand, since T1 talks of a historical writer called Clodius, and, Quadrigarius apart, no such Clo(au)dius is known other than the author(s) of the two fragments, and both fragments refer to a work which could be described as being 'chronological', there is a presumption in favour of the Clodius of T1 being the author of F1 and F2. The title of F1, which must mean 'Critique of Chronology' (it is possible that Clodius did indeed use *elenchus* in his title, as later did M. Pompilius Andronicus (Suet. *gramm.* 8; Suetonius indicates that he was a near contemporary of Antonius Gnipho, who lived from 114 to 64;[5] Andronicus was, of course, a Greek)). The fact that Appian (F2) can call the work *χρονικαὶ συντάξεις* ('Chronological Treatises') perhaps suggests a detailed narrative with particular attention to matters of chronology; since F1 talks of a single *βιβλίον*, perhaps the first book had the sub-title *ἔλεγχος χρόνων* and contained a critique of the Roman chronology of Clodius' predecessors.

It is no objection to the identification that in F2 the writer is given the *praenomen* Paulus; for Paulus as a *praenomen* cf. *auct. de praen.* 2, Mommsen, *RF* 1. 34–5 (see apparatus to F2).

(JB)

[5] Cf. Goetz, *RE* 1. 2618.

17

Cn. Aufidius

Editions: Peter 1[2], ccxl–ccxli; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 814; H. Beck, *BNJ* 814.

Principal discussions: E. Klebs, 'Cn. Aufidius (6)', *RE* 2 (1896), 2289; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 327; R. Syme, 'Missing senators', *Historia* 4 (1955), 52–71, at 55–6; H. Mattingly, 'The date of the *sc. de agro Pergameno*', *AJPh* 93 (1972), 412–23, at 421; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 169; Brennan, *Praetorship* (2000), 548–9; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 376.

INTRODUCTION

Cn. Aufidius was a senator who reached the praetorship and was later seen and heard by the young Cicero (T4)—probably therefore in the 90s BC. Cicero also tells us that he went blind (T3) and that in extreme old age he adopted Orestes (T1)—probably Cn. Aufidius Orestes, the consul of 71 (*MRR* 2. 125 n.2). This may have been the consequence of the loss of his own son(s), if he is the Aufidius whose bereavements are referred to in T2. More than one Cn. Aufidius is known to have held the praetorship in the late second century: the praetor Cn. Aufidius T. f. (not in *RE*) of *SIG*[3] 715 (from Rhegium, dated by Dittenberger before 100 BC), and Cn. Aufidius Cn. f. (*RE* no.7) who was propraetor of Asia perhaps in 107 or 106 (*IG* 12.5.722, from Adramyttium), whose praetorship is placed in 107 by Broughton (*MRR* 1. 552 and n. 2), but could well have been earlier (Mattingly, *AJPh* 93 (1972), 421). Either of these men could be our author. He could also be the *Γναῖος Αὐφ[ίδιος* who is listed as a young senator or equestrian in the *s.c. de agro Pergameno* (Sherk, *RDGE* 12, line 45), if that document is correctly dated to 129 BC (thus Syme, *Historia* 4 (1955), 55–6 and Broughton, *MRR* 3. 29). On the alternative date of 101 BC (D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), 2. 1055 n. 23; Mattingly, *AJPh* 93 (1972), 412–23; Badian, *LCM* 11 (1986), 15–16; Brennan, *Praetorship*, 341 n. 80; 671) this man would be the son of one of the two praetorian Aufidii (Brennan, *Praetorship*, 930 n. 511).

The one fragment (F1), if genuine and if it refers to our Aufidius, comes from a work called *Epitomae*, which would be a plausible title for a short history in Greek (cf. e.g. Zenodotus of Ephesus, *FGrHist* 19 F1, Zenon, *FGrHist* 158 F1). The passage of Pliny, *nat.* 6.27, dealing with Armenia, is assigned by Peter to Aufidius Bassus (78), we think rightly (see on Aufidius Bassus 78 F3).

(CJS)

18

M. Aemilius Scaurus

Editions: Peter 1[2]. ccxlvi–cclii, 184–5; Chassignet 3. lxxxviii–xciii, 160–3.

Principal discussions: E. Klebs, 'M. Aemilius (140) Scaurus', *RE* 1 (1893), 584–8; G. Bloch, 'M. Aemilius Scaurus. Étude sur l'histoire des partis au vii[e] siècle de Rome', *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne* (Paris, 1909), 1–81; P. Fraccaro, 'Scauriana', *RAL* ser. 5, 20 (1911), 169–96 (= *Opuscula* 2 (1957), 125–47); Leo, *GRL* (1913), 344–5; E. Pais, 'M. Emilio Scauro: i soi processi e la sua autobiografia', in *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto* (Rome, 1918), 91–167, esp. 137–53; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 205–6; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 108–10; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 23; G. Flammini, 'Marco Emilio Scauro e i suoi frammenti', *AFLM* 10 (1977), 37–56; R. L. Bates, '*Rex in senatu*: a political biography of M. Aemilius Scaurus', *PAPhS* 130 (1986), 251–88; R. G. Lewis, 'Scope for Scaurus', *Athenaeum* 89 (2001), 345–54; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 440–3; J. M. Candau, 'Republican Rome' in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 121–59, at 133–9.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

M. Aemilius Scaurus was one of the most powerful and controversial figures of his generation. He was born in 163/2[2] into a branch of the patrician Aemilii which had fallen on hard times.[3] His father is said to have worked as a charcoal merchant and Scaurus himself to have wondered whether to engage in politics or banking (T5); hard work, like that required of a *nouus homo*, enabled him to restore the fortunes of his house (Cic. *Mur.* 16; Ascon. 23C). After military service in Spain and Sardinia, he entered the senate, held the curule aedileship probably in 122, and reached the praetorship (at the latest in 119).[4] As consul in 115 (after being defeated in the election for the previous year) he carried a sumptuary law and a law regulating the votes of freedmen, and won a triumph over the Ligurians and Gauls. Most remarkably for a man of his status, the censors of 115 appointed him *princeps senatus*. In 112 he was one of the ambassadors sent to urge Jugurtha to abandon the siege of Cirta. War was declared on Jugurtha in 111; Scaurus was one of the *legati* under the consul

[1] Detailed evidence can readily be found in *MRR*. Modern discussions of his political career are given by Bloch, Fraccaro, and Pais; there is a useful summary in Flammini, *AFLM* 10 (1977), 37–47. The article by Bates, *PAPhS* 130 (1986), 251–88, gives a clear account of the facts, but adds little by way of analysis and does not touch on the question of the autobiography.

[2] Ascon. 22C, saying that he was 72 when accused under the *lex Varia* in 90.

[3] On his family, perhaps descended from the Aemilii Barbulae, see Bloch, 'M. Aemilius Scaurus' (1909), 6–9; F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920), 280 = *Roman Aristocratic Families and Parties* (Baltimore, 1999), 257.

[4] T5; cf. *MRR* 1. 519 n. 3. If the text is correct, the statement in T5(4) that he campaigned against Jugurtha as praetor is an error. On his praetorship see Brennan, *Praetorship*, 541–2, and comm. on F3.

L. Calpurnius Bestia, and was involved in the negotiations leading to Jugurtha's surrender. Sallust's allegation (*Iug.* 29.2) that Scaurus, having initially resisted Jugurtha's bribes, was finally seduced, can be rejected.[5] In 109 Scaurus was one of the three *quaesitores* ('presidents of the court') appointed, under the *lex Mamilia*, for the trials of those accused of taking bribes from Jugurtha.

For the remainder of his life Scaurus was the dominant figure in Roman politics (Cicero (*Font.* 24) famously says that the whole world was ruled by the nod of his head). Although a leading optimate and an enemy of Marius, he nevertheless supported Marius' appointment to the command against the Cimbri (Cic. *prou. cons.* 19), and later, in 100 BC, urged him to take action against Saturninus and Glaucia (T5.9; Val. Max. 3.2.18). He had been a prominent opponent of Saturninus from the beginning (Cic. *har. resp.* 43; *Sest.* 39), and during the riots of 103 had been injured by a flying stone (Cic. *de orat.* 2.197). In spite of his age he joined other leading senators in taking up arms to suppress the threatened popular revolution in 100 (Cic. *Rab. perd.* 21; Val. Max. 3.2.18). At the end of the 90s Scaurus supported the proposals of M. Livius Drusus (Cic. *dom.* 50; Ascon. 21C), including the enfranchisement of the Italians. He was prosecuted under the *lex Varia* in 90, but the prosecution was eventually abandoned.[6] He was dead by 88, when his widow Metella married Sulla (Plut. *Sulla* 6.18).[7]

Work

Scaurus wrote an autobiography in three books (T1–2), dedicated to L. Fufidius (T1, 3).[8] According to the virtually unanimous view of a wide range of sources the work was entitled *De uita sua*,[9] implying that it was a complete account of his life to the time of writing, not just a memoir of a particular set of events such as a military campaign, as a title such as *commentarii* might have implied (on *commentarii* see introduction to Cicero, no. 39).

All the fragments that can be given any kind of context refer to Scaurus' earlier career down to his consulship: F1 concerns his inheritance, F3 and 5–7 military matters. In F3, F5, and F7 Scaurus is clearly the commander, and these fragments must therefore refer to his campaign as consul in 115. That being so, since F3 is cited from the last book of the autobiography, we may deduce that the years after his consulship occupied only a relatively small proportion, if any, of the whole. There is no indication anywhere of the date of publication, and although scholars have tended to assume that the work was produced in Scaurus' last years,[10] it is perhaps more probable that it was completed well before the end of his life and did not cover the

[5] See Syme, *Sallust*, 164–5.

[6] Ascon. 22C; *uir. ill.* 72 (T5).11; Quint. 5.12.10; cf. comm. on Sisenna 26 F21 and 33.

[7] On the date of Scaurus' death cf. Tansey, *Historia* 52 (2003), 378–83; on Metella see III. 292.

[8] Pais (*Dalle guerre puniche* (1918), 152–3) identified the dedicatee L. Fufidius with the notorious friend of Sulla (perhaps praetor in 81; cf. Sall. *hist.* 1.55.22, Plut. *Sull.* 31.4, Flor. 2.9.25, Oros. 5.21.3).

[9] Cicero (T1); Valerius Maximus (T2), Pliny (T3), Charisius (F2), Diomedes (F3, 4, 6), Servius (auctus) (F7). Cf also Tacitus (T4).

[10] Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 442; Chassignet 3. xci, suggesting posthumous publication. The argument is based on the assumption that episodes from Scaurus' later life in e.g. Valerius Maximus and *uir. ill.* 72 (T5) are taken from the autobiography. Thus Badian, 'Early historians', 37 n. 126.

controversial period from *c.*112 to his death (*c.*89).[11] On the other hand it is possible that, as with other autobiographies and biographies, the narrative of military campaigns occupied the greater part of the work, and that the last years formed a kind of appendix.[12] In the present state of the evidence the question must remain open.

A striking feature of the work, apparent from two of the fragments (F3, 7), is that it seems to have been written in the first person—probably an innovation in Roman historiography,[13] as indeed was the very idea of writing an autobiography, as far as we know. It was a bold and assertive gesture, seemingly characteristic of its remarkable author. That it included a strong element of political apology and self-justification is likely,[14] but cannot be demonstrated on the evidence of the surviving fragments.

Of the seven surviving fragments five (F2–4, 6–7) are cited for linguistic reasons, not their content; and the work is never quoted as a source for the political and military events in which Scaurus played such a prominent part. On the other hand we possess a great deal of personal information about him, and it is worth asking how much of this material, if any, goes back to his own account.

In the *Brutus* (46 BC) Cicero tells us that no one read Scaurus' autobiography (T1), which at least indicates that it had fallen out of favour, except with Cicero himself, who had good reason to know it. In 54 he had defended Scaurus' son Marcus on a charge of *repetundae*, referring to his famous father on a number of occasions (Cic. *Scaur.* frg. 1.2–5, §§45, 49). Cicero also mentions him favourably at *Verr.* 1.52, *Font.* 38, *Rab. perd.* 26, *Mur.* 36, and *fam.* 1.9.16.

The only real indication, however, that Cicero took material from the *De uita sua*, rather than from Scaurus' speeches, which appear to have circulated in published form (T1), is his knowledge that Scaurus had achieved success despite his lack of inherited wealth. In both the *Pro Scauro* and the *Pro Murena* Cicero mentions his revival of the family's fortunes, and more detail is provided by Asconius (23C), Valerius Maximus (F1), and *uir. ill.* (T5.1–2). But Cicero may have learnt all this from the younger Scaurus in person; equally, it may have been common knowledge, and is hardly conclusive proof that Cicero drew upon the autobiography.

It has been argued that the short biography of Scaurus in *De uiris illustribus* 72 (T5) was based, directly or indirectly, on his account of his own life.[15] Others have said the

[11] Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 661–2, and n. 107, developed further in *Athenaeum* 89 (2001), 345–54) presents arguments for supposing that the work culminated with Scaurus' triumph in 115.

[12] As for example in the *Agricola*. See B. Rankov, *Journ. Promotion of Class. Studs* (Seoul) 8 (2000), 117–18.

[13] See comm. on F3 and 7. First person narrative was probably used in letters, such as those of Scipio Africanus and Scipio Nasica Corculum, but they represent a very different genre (see I. Appendix 1, A15–16). We do not know if earlier Roman historians, such as Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, and Cato, who undoubtedly played their part in events, described their own activities in the first person or the third; most probably they followed the example of Thucydides, and wrote about themselves as actors in the third person (as Thuc. 4.104–5), but used the first person when speaking of themselves as authors (e.g. Thuc.1.22). Postumius (4 F1b–c) is a clear example of the latter. On Cato's practice see commentary to 5 F20, and cf. the introduction to Trajan (no. 96). Polybius, on the other hand, described his own actions in a mixture of the first and third persons: see his self-conscious discussion at 36.11–12.

[14] Badian, 'Early historians', 23.

[15] Pais, *Dalle guerre puniche* (1918), 146–52. Badian asserts that *uir. ill.* 72 'must be ultimately based on [Scaurus'] own work' ('Early historians', 23).

same about stories concerning Scaurus in Valerius Maximus.[16] This is possible but cannot be certain, especially as we do not know if the autobiography covered Scaurus' later years, to which the stories in Valerius Maximus belong. To argue on the basis of these texts that the autobiography went down to the end of his life (see n. 11) is to beg the question. Indeed, one could more plausibly draw the opposite conclusion, since Valerius Maximus cites the autobiography only when dealing with Scaurus' early life (F1).

This was a period that was well remembered by men of Cicero's generation, and its events and leading personalities were recorded by many contemporary historians. To assume that personal anecdotes about a major public figure could only come from one source would be to misunderstand the nature of the rich historical tradition for this period that must once have existed. This point is further emphasized by the evidence for a hostile tradition, most clearly evident in Sallust, who presents Scaurus as greedy, manipulative, corrupt, and duplicitous (*Jug.* 15.4–5; 28.4; 29.2–5; 30.2; 32.1;40.4); but elements of this tradition certainly existed before Sallust and were transmitted independently of him.[17] The hostile tradition proves that other sources of personal information were available besides the autobiography, and consequently that nothing should be definitively attributed to Scaurus without explicit evidence.[18]

(CJS)

[16] Pais, *RAL* scr. 5, 10 (1901) 51; *Dalle guerre puniche* (1918), 140–3; Flammini, *AFLM* 10 (1977), 51–4. *Contra*: Lewis, *Athenaeum* 89 (2001), 349–51.

[17] A. La Penna, *Sallustio e la rivoluzione romana* (2nd edn., Milan, 1979), 178–90.

[18] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1, 109, is rightly cautious.

19

Q. Lutatius Catulus

Editions: Peter 1[2]. cclxii–cclxix, 191–4; P. Cugusi, *Epistolographi Latini Minores* 1.1 (1970), 114–16; Chassignet 3. xcvii–xcix, 170–1.

Principal discussions: R. Büttner, *Porcius Licinus und der literarische Kreis des Q. Lutatius Catulus* (Leipzig, 1893); A. Solari, 'I Lutazi e lo storico Lutazio Catulo', *RFIC* 34 (1906), 129–42; Leo, *GRL* (1913), 343–4; Cichorius, *RS* (1922), 103–4; Münzer, 'Q. Lutatius (7) Catulus', *RE* 13 (1927), 2072–82; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 206–7; Bardon, 'Q. Lutatius Catulus et son cercle litteraire', *LEC* 18 (1950), 145–64 (= *Litt. inconnue*, 1 (1952), 115–32); P. Cugusi, 'Studi sull'epistolografia latina 1: l'età preciceroniana', *AFLC* 33 (1970), 5–112, esp. 33–9; R. G. Lewis, 'Catulus and the Cimbri, 102 BC', *Hermes* 102 (1974), 90–109; G. Marasco, 'L'apologia di Q. Lutazio Catulo e la tradizione sulla guerra cimbrica', *GFF* 7 (1984), 75–84; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 447–53; T. Baier, 'Autobiographie in der späten römischen Republik', in M. Reichel (ed.), *Antike Autobiographien* (Vienna, 2005), 123–42, esp. 134–8; J. M. Candau, 'Republican Rome' in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 121–59, at 147–51.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Quintus Lutatius Catulus was born about 150 BC, into a noble plebeian family which had not recently produced any notable figures.[2] His widowed mother Popillia married L. Julius Caesar, father of the consul of 90,[3] and he himself married the sister of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 96) and later the daughter of Q. Servilius Caepio (cos. 106).[4]

Praetor by 109 at the latest, Catulus stood unsuccessfully for the consulship for three years running (107–105 BC: Cic. *Planc.* 12), before eventually securing election for 102, probably with the help of Marius,[5] who became his colleague. He was appointed to command against the Cimbri, but failed to hold the positions he had fortified on the river Adige. Nevertheless his command was extended for the following year (101), when he and Marius together defeated the Cimbri at Campi Raudii near Vercellae, and celebrated a joint triumph. The booty enabled Catulus to

[1] On Catulus' life, apart from Münzer's *RE* article, see particularly Badian, *Studies*, 37–8, 46, 51.

[2] Q. Lutatius Catulus (242 BC), Q. Lutatius Cerco (241), and C. Lutatius Catulus (220) were the only members of the *gens* who had previously reached the consulship.

[3] Münzer, *RE* 13. 2072.

[4] Badian, *Studies*, 218, 232–3 n. 7, against the opinion of Münzer, *RE* 13. 2073, and his own earlier view (*Studies*, 37–8), that she was Caepio's sister.

[5] See Diod. 38.4.3, with the circumstantial arguments of Badian, *Studies*, 37–8, 51; *contra* Lewis, *Hermes* 102 (1974), 107 n. 58.

build a portico on the Palatine and a temple of *Fortuna huiusce diei* ('The Fortune of This Day') in the Campus Martius.[6] He took part in the suppression of Glaucia and Saturninus in 100 (Cic. *Phil.* 8.15) and fought in the Social War (Cic. *Font.* 43).

But at some point, possibly soon after their joint triumph, relations between Catulus and Marius turned sour, as each tried to claim the credit for the victory over the German invaders and to minimize the role of his colleague. What had once been an amicable and effective partnership[7] turned to bitter hatred, and Catulus became one of the principal victims of Marius' revenge when he occupied the city in 87. Catulus was prosecuted on a capital charge by the tribune Marius Gratidianus and, after vainly appealing to Marius, took his own life in anticipation of inevitable conviction.[8]

Catulus was an extremely important figure in the literary and intellectual history of the late second and early first centuries BC. He was a devotee of Greek culture, and in book 2 of the *De oratore* Cicero made him the spokesman for Greek literature, philosophy, and art. He also wrote love-poetry and translated Callimachean epigrams into Latin, and is thus often regarded as the precursor of neotericism at Rome; he was the patron of Antipater of Sidon (Cic. *de orat.* 3.194) and Archias of Corinth (Cic. *Arch.* 6, schol. Bob. 176).[9]

Work

Cicero (T1) says that Catulus wrote a (*sc.* single) book *de consulatu et de rebus gestis suis* ('on his consulship and achievements'),[10] composed *molli et Xenophontio genere sermonis* ('in a gentle and Xenophontic style'), and addressed to the poet A. Furius.[11] In a mutilated and difficult passage Fronto (T2) speaks of a letter (*litterae*) in which Catulus described his actions in the field. The passage occurs in a long discussion of Lucius Verus' dispatch to the senate, whose style Fronto thought was as worthy of admiration as the military achievements it described. He lists a series of famous letters from field commanders reported by historians (specifically Thucydides and Sallust), but notes that they are brief and do not describe events, in contrast to Verus' letter. The letter of Catulus, however, *is* comparable—but only in part: its style is high-flown, and it is written *teneris prope uerbis*. This perhaps recalls Cicero's comment that the work was written *molli et Xenophontio genere sermonis*.[12] In the following sentence Fronto contrasts the style of history, which should be written *splendide*, with the restrained manner suitable for a dispatch to the senate. The implication would seem to be that Verus' dispatch was similar to Catulus' *litterae* in content but different in

[6] On the portico see E. Papi, *LTUR* 4, 119; S. M. Cerruti, *AJPh* 118 (1997), 417–26; on the temple, to be identified with Temple B of the Largo Argentina, P. Gros, *LTUR* 2. 269–70; Coarelli, *Campo Marzio*, 1. 275–92.

[7] Cicero likened Catulus at the time of Vercellae to a second Laelius (*Tusc.* 5.56); cf. App. *b.c.* 1.74.341, who says that Marius saved Catulus' life.

[8] Cf. M. Alexander, *Trials in the Late Roman Republic* (Toronto, 1990), 60.

[9] See Büttner, *Porcius Licinus und der literarische Kreis* (1893) (very speculative); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 117–32; Gabba, *Athenaeum* 31 (1953), 259–72; Badian, *Studies*, 65 n. 50; Douglas on Cic. *Brut.* 132; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 4–5 with n. 7.

[10] Perhaps a description of the contents rather than the actual title. Marasco, *GFF* 7 (1984), 76.

[11] The latter is probably the Furius Antias cited by Gellius 18.11; Catulus perhaps hoped that he would use it as material for a poem about his campaigns: see below, and n. 15.

[12] Thus van den Hout, *Comm.* 299, ad loc.

style, and that the latter were written in the manner of a historian (hence Hauler's conjectured supplement *historici exemplo exposuit*: 'he set forth [his deeds] in the manner of a historian'). The work of Catulus that Fronto was referring to cannot therefore have been a letter to the senate,[13] and must have been a published literary product in historical style.

Nothing precludes the identification of Cicero's *liber* and Fronto's *litterae*,[14] and the only surprise is that a work that was barely known in Cicero's time should have been available to Fronto, who obviously knew it at first hand (wrongly doubted by Peter, cclxv). The work may therefore have been in the form of a letter addressed to Furius,[15] although the key point as far as Fronto was concerned was not so much its form as its content; which prompts the conclusion already indicated by the evidence of Cicero and the three probable fragments, namely that Catulus' work was not an autobiography, but an account of his actions in the field in the war against the Cimbri. It was this fact that made it comparable to Verus' letter. In form it may have resembled what were later known as *commentarii*, preceded by an address to Furius, perhaps with an explicit suggestion that he should use it as the subject of an epic poem.[16]

The three fragments that must come from this work, although they are not explicitly so assigned, all come from Plutarch's description, in the life of Marius, of the battle of Vercellae. In none of them is Catulus cited directly, but rather unspecified authors who report (*ἱστοροῦσι, λέγουσι*) his statements. Both F1 and F2 are preceded by citations of Sulla (Sulla 22 F8–9), who probably made extensive use of Catulus' work; it would have suited his purpose if (as seems likely from F1 and F3) it denigrated Marius. It is likely that Sulla's autobiography was one of the sources from which Plutarch took his second-hand quotations.[17] Another possibility is Posidonius.[18] Plutarch had read both, and other sources besides; and we do not have to assume that his references to authors in the plural is merely a rhetorical device. Catulus' version of the events of 102–101 is likely to have been very influential in the formation of a historical tradition that is profoundly hostile to Marius.[19]

F4 is included only as a possible fragment, first because the reading *Catulus* is open to challenge (see comm. ad loc.), and second because the work from which it is taken is not clearly identifiable.

The fragments of the *communis historia* of Lutatius, sometimes identified with Catulus, are here attributed to a different Lutatius (no. 32).

(CJS)

[13] As some have supposed, e.g. Cichorius, *RS* 103–4; van den Hout, *Comm.* 298 (arguing that Cicero's *liber* was a rewritten and polished version of Catulus' report to the senate). The idea (Büttner, *Porcius Licinus und der literarische Kreis* (1893), 178, though it was first suggested by Niebuhr), that Fronto is referring to a letter to the senate by the younger Catulus (cos. 78) after the suppression of Lepidus' revolt in 77, is nowadays generally rejected (cf. H. Jordan, *Hermes* 6 (1872), 74–5; Marasco, *GFF* 7 (1984), 77).

[14] Thus Peter cclxv; Münzer, *RE* 13. 2075; Marasco, *GFF* 7 (1984), 77.

[15] H. Jordan, *Hermes* 6 (1872), 68–9; Schanz–Hosius 1⁴. 207; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 120; P. Cugusi, *AFLC* 33 (1970), 33–5; Marasco, *GFF* 7 (1984), 77.

[16] Thus Peter cclxiv–cclxv; Münzer, *RE* 13. 2075; Marasco, *GFF* 7 (1984), 76; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 450–1.

[17] Peter cclxvi; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 120; Marasco, *GFF* 7 (1984), 83.

[18] A. Solari, *Atti congr. int. scienze storiche* (Rome, 1905), 2. 373; Lewis, *Hermes* 52 (1974), 91 n. 2, 101; J. Malitz, *Die Historien des Poseidonios* (Munich, 1983), 226–8.

[19] Badian, *Studies*, 65 n. 49; Lewis, *Hermes* 52 (1974), 90–1.

20

Sempronius Asellio

Editions: W. Stelkens, *Der römische Geschichtsschreiber Sempronius Asellio* (Progr. Crefeld, 1867); Peter 1^2. ccxlii–ccxlv, 179–84; Chassignet 2. liv–lvii, 84–9, 159–64; Beck–Walter 2. 84–99.

Principal discussions: C. Nipperdey, 'Zur geschichte der römischen Historiographie', *Philologus* 6 (1851), 134–6; J. Martha, 'L'Histoire à Rome. Les auteurs de mémoires', *RCC* 11 (1902–3), 2.539–46; A. Klotz, 'Sempronius (16) Asellio', *RE* 2A.4 (1923), 1362–3; R. Till, 'Sempronius Asellio', *WJA* 4 (1949–50), 330–4; F. Bömer, 'Thematik und Krise der römischen Geschichtsschreibung im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *Historia* 2 (1953–4), 189–209; M. Mazza, 'Sul testo del frammento 2 Peter di Sempronio Asellione', in *Studi in memoria di Carmelo Sgroi* (Turin, 1965), 571–6; id., 'Sulla tematica della storiografia romana di epoca sillana: il frg. 1–2 Peter di Sempronio Asellione', *SicGymn* 18.1 (1965), 144–63; B. Gentili, 'Storiografia greca e storiografia romana arcaica', *StudUrb (B)* 49.1 (1975), 13–38; C. Schäublin, 'Sempronius Asellio fr. 2', *WJA* NS 9 (1983), 147–55; F. Cavazza, 'Sempronius Asellio fr. 2 Peter', *Orpheus* 9, (1988), 21–37; A. Mazzarino, 'Sul proemio delle *Historiae* di Sempronio Asellione', *Helikon* 28 (1988), 145–68; G. P. Verbrugghe, 'On the Meaning of *Annales* and Annalist', *Philologus* 133 (1989), 192–230; I. Mariotti, 'Sempronio Asellione, fr. 2 P', in *Mousa. Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli*, ed. E. Degani *et al.* (Bologna, 1997), 261–4; M. Ambrosetti, 'Il proemio delle Historiae di Sempronio Asellione nel quadro degli indirizzi della storiografia latina arcaica', *RAL* 9.9.2 (1998), 193–231; P. Soverini, 'Nota a Sempronius Asellio, fr. 2 Peter', *BSL* 29 (1999), 21–6; A. Mehl, *Römische Geschichtsschreibung* (Stuttgart, 2001), 57–8; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 435–7; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 38–42.

INTRODUCTION

Life

We do not know Sempronius Asellio's *praenomen*,[1] and there is only one ancient testimony about his life (T2), which reports that he was a military tribune under Scipio Africanus (the younger) at Numantia, and that he wrote an account of those affairs in which he himself participated. There is ambiguity about whether 'those affairs in which he himself participated' refers specifically to his participation at Numantia, or includes other activity as well. However, this brief notice is much more informative than it may appear at first sight. It tells us that Asellio held his junior officership in 134 and/or 133, in the campaign that ended with the sack of Numantia and finally established Roman dominance in Spain. He was therefore one of a group of young men serving under Scipio who were destined to play a major part in Roman political life over subsequent decades. They include P. Rutilius Rufus (no. 21) and Memmius (perhaps C. Memmius, praetor in 104), both of whom, like Asellio,

[1] There is no warrant for calling him 'Publius', as did all editors from Popma to Krause, and also Lachmann: see Peter ccxlii.

were military tribunes, together with C. Gracchus, C. Marius, and C. Lucilius, whose positions are unclear;[2] also present were some of Scipio's non-Roman clients, including Jugurtha, the future king of Numidia, and (probably) the veteran Greek historian Polybius.[3]

Given the date of Asellio's military tribunate, his date of birth is likely to have been around 160. Other attested Sempronii Aselliones belong to the following generation—L. Sempronius Asellio (*RE* 18), praetor in Sicily *c.*92 BC, who restored order after a slave revolt,[4] and A. Sempronius Asellio (*RE* 17), urban praetor in 89, who was murdered by creditors in the Forum when he attempted to offer relief to debtors during the Social War.[5] Nothing is recorded of our Asellio's career after the Numantine War, not even whether he became a senator; even so it seems rather extreme to call him a 'failed' aristocrat (as Beck–Walter[6]). The surviving fragments do not allow us a clear picture of his political inclinations, although there is a hint in F8 (cf. F7) of sympathy for Tiberius Gracchus. But F2 does suggest that he spoke in patriotic tones about the *res publica*.

Work

We accept the attribution of fifteen fragments to Asellio.[7] The title of his work may have been *res gestae*, the term which Aulus Gellius uses in F7, F10, and F11, but Gellius also uses *historia* (F6), while at F13 he refers to Asellio and other authors as *historiae scriptores*. Of the grammarians who cite him, Priscian (once) and Nonius (twice) refer to his work as *historiae* (F3–5), while Charisius once has *res Romanae* (F9) and once *historiae* (F12); both references from the Virgil scholia have *historiae* (F14 and F15). It is clear from T2 (cf. F7) that Asellio wrote contemporary history. In F1 and F2 he attacks *annales*, and distinguishes between 'the sort of writer who wished to leave behind annals' and 'the sort who tried to write a thorough account of the things accomplished by the Romans'. He is clearly referring to two groups of writers.[8] It is not an easy matter, however, to identify the authors of such *annales* (see

[2] Rutilius: App. *Hisp.* 88.382 (=Rutilius 21 T4); Cic. *rep.* 1.17; *Suda* s.v. Ῥουτίλιος Ῥοῦφος. Memmius: Frontin. *strat.* 4.1.1; Plut. *mor.* 201C. C. Gracchus: Plut. *TG* 13.1. Marius: Vell. 2.9.4; Val. Max. 8.15.7; Plut. *Mar.* 3.2–4; 13.2. Lucilius: Vell. 2.9.4.

[3] Jugurtha: Sall. *Iug.* 7–10; App. *Hisp.* 89.387. In general on Scipio's friends and clients, including non-Romans, see App. *Hisp.* 84.365, with Richardson's note ad loc. The presence of Polybius is not directly attested, but is deduced from the fact that he accompanied Scipio on all his travels and campaigns, and that he wrote a separate work on the Numantine War (Cic. *fam.* 5.12.2). See Walbank, *Comm.* 1. 6; id., *Polybius* (Berkeley, 1972), 12.

[4] Diod. 37.8.1–4; see Brennan, *Praetorship*, 480. Badian (*PACA* 11 (1968) [1970], 2) suggests that he was the historian's eldest son, giving the presumptive *praenomen* 'Lucius' for the historian.

[5] Livy *per.* 74; Val. Max. 9.7.4; App. *b.c.* 1.54.235–9; see Brennan, *Praetorship*, 443. Gabba rightly notes, ad loc., that this Asellio can hardly be identical with the historian. Badian (*PACA* 11 (1968) [1970], 2) suggests that he was the historian's younger son.

[6] p. 86.

[7] The body of fragments attributed to Asellio has undergone very little change since Agustin (of our fifteen, only F14 and F15 did not appear in his work; Popma adds F15, but takes away F3, attributing it to the histories of 'Agellius'; Peter added F14 in *HRR* in 1870, and restored F3 in *HRF* in 1883). Only ten fragments had appeared in Riccoboni's second edition.

[8] The *annales* in question are thus not the pontifical chronicle, *pace* M. Gelzer, *Hermes* 69 (1934), 46 n.3 (=*Kl. Schr.* 93 n. 3); Mazza, *SicGymn* 18.1 (1965), 162–3; Schäublin, *WJA* NS 9 (1983), 151–5.

comm. on F1). His own view is that history should not simply list events but should explain how things happened, including the purposes and plans of those involved and the relevant political setting (in respect of the activity both of the senate and of the popular assemblies). It is clear that this approach shows the influence of Polybius, who placed similar emphasis on the importance of explanation:[9] cf. Pol. 1.1.5; 2.1.1–2; 3.1.3–5; 3.4.4–8; 3.20.5; 11.19a; 12.25b. Asellio's history, in Polybian terms, could be seen as not just *ἱστορία πραγματική* (history concerned with recent and contemporary affairs) but *ἱστορία ἀποδεικτική* (history concerned with methodical exposition and explanation).[10] If only because they were probably both at Numantia (cf. n. 3), it is more than likely that Asellio had encountered Polybius in person. However, there are important differences in their work. Polybius, although very familiar with Rome and closely connected with aristocratic Romans, was writing as an outsider, seeking to explain to a wider world the phenomenal rise of Rome. Asellio saw the function of history as in part patriotic, to rouse (in this case, Roman) readers to the defence of the commonwealth. It is not clear what attitude Asellio professed to autopsy (of particular significance in Polybius' conception of history[11]), since it is from Gellius rather than Asellio himself that we hear of his participation in the Numantine campaign. But it is a reasonable supposition that he presented his own involvement in events that he covered as adding to the authenticity of his account.

The structure of Asellio's work is not clear. Given what Asellio says about *annales*, we may suspect that he did not himself adopt an annalistic structure, or at least not a straightforward one, but it cannot be ruled out that years were a significant structural element in his account (as they were for Polybius). However, there are no strong grounds for accepting the precise schemes of Nipperdey and Morelli.[12] The total of books may have been fourteen—the latest datable event in Asellio's fragments, attributed to book 14, is the killing of Drusus in 91 (F11), by which time Asellio would have been approaching his seventies—but it may have been higher. It is not clear how far back his history went, and there are no strong grounds for thinking that he continued Polybius' history from 146 onwards, though it is striking that there appears to be a concentration of surviving fragments pertaining to the 130s (F5–8, F13). It is possible that Asellio's history was concerned exclusively with the events of his own lifetime.[13] For the possibility that Sisenna continued Asellio's work from 91, see the Introduction to Sisenna (26), I. 308.

Since no fewer than thirteen of the fifteen fragments of Asellio are verbatim quotations, we have more evidence than we might expect about Asellio's use of

[9] So e.g. M. Mazza, *StCGymn* 18.1 (1965), 151–63.

[10] See B. Gentili, G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought* (Amsterdam, 1988), 52–6, esp. 55–6.

[11] *POxy* 4808, col. ii, 21–35.

[12] Nipperdey (*Philologus* 6 (1851), 136) proposed that each of the first four books covered two years, Morelli (*StudUrb (B)* 49.1 (1975), 81–94, esp. 93) that the period 156–87 BC was covered in fourteen books, with five years to each book.

[13] See Klotz, *RE* 2A.4. 1362; H. Berneder in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg (eds.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum* (Stuttgart, 2006), 695.

language. See General Introduction, Section 3, I. 28–9. However, the pleasing touches of humour in F13 (the joke about the 'pontifex maximus', and the final clause of the fragment in particular), which may be due to Asellio, may rather be due to his source, or indeed to Aulus Gellius himself.

It does not appear that much attention was paid to Asellio's history until it found favour with Gellius, who is responsible for eight of the fifteen fragments we possess.[14] As is clear from T1, Cicero thought its style a step backwards from Coelius.

(MPP)

[14] Note, however, the view of Berneder (cit. n. 13, 706–7) that Asellio's history may have been rather more influential than has been allowed.

21

P. Rutilius Rufus

Editions: Peter 1^2. ccliv–cclxi,187–90; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 815; Chassignet 3. x–xvi (*hist.*), xciv–xcvi (*dvs*), 2–5 (*hist.*), 164–9 (*dvs*) (cf. n. 15); Beck–Walter 2. 100–8 (*hist.*); H. Beck, *BNJ* 815.

Principal discussions: E. Pais, 'L'autobiografia ed il processo "repetundarum" di P. Rutilio Rufo', in *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto* (Rome, 1918), 35–89; Leo, *GRL* (1913), 345–6; Münzer, 'P. Rutilius (34) Rufus', *RE* 1A (1914), 1269–80; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 207–9; G. L. Hendrickson, 'The memoirs of Rutilius Rufus', *CPh* 28 (1933), 153–75; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1 (1952), 110–13; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 23–5; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 443–7; J. M. Candau, 'Republican Rome', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 121–59, at 139–47.

INTRODUCTION

Life

P. Rutilius Rufus was born, at the latest, in 158,[1] and Velleius' statement (T2) that he was a contemporary of Sisenna cannot therefore be right (see introduction to Sisenna, no. 26). He was probably the son of P. Rutilius Calvus, praetor in 166.[2] Details of his early career are scarce. In 134 he served as military tribune under Scipio Aemilianus at Numantia (T4; Cic. *rep.* 1.17), and later stood unsuccessfully for the tribunate of the plebs (*Cic. Planc.* 52). Curule offices can be assumed, including a praetorship by 118 at the latest,[3] since he stood, again unsuccessfully, for the consulship of 115 (a defeat followed by an exchange of accusations between him and his successful rival, M. Aemilius Scaurus (T1)). He served under Metellus as a *legatus* in the Jugurthine War together with Marius, until the latter took over command as consul in 107.[4] On his return to Rome he stood again for the consulship (of 105), this time successfully. As consul he introduced emergency measures and new forms of military training after the disaster of Arausio (Licinian. 23.25–7; Val. Max. 2.3.2)

Rutilius is next heard of as a *legatus* in the province of Asia under Q. Mucius Scaevola (*cos.* 95) either between 99 and 97 or in 95–94.[5] On Scaevola's return to

[1] This follows from the fact that he stood for the consulship of 115 (see below). Chassignet 3. x, places his birth 'au plus tôt en 158 av. J.-C., probablement vers 154', an uncharacteristic error.

[2] *RE* no. 12. For the filiation see Badian, *Chiron* 20 (1990), 387, implicitly rejecting the view of Münzer that he was the son of P. Rutilius (*RE* no. 8), tr. pl. 169 (Livy 43.16.3–16, 44.16.8).

[3] If he is the P. Rutilius referred to in Gaius *inst.* 4.35 and Ulpian *dig.* 38.2.1.1, he would have been *praetor urbanus*, but the identification is not certain (Brennan, *Praetorship*, 305 n. 296).

[4] Rutilius was in temporary command of the army between the departure of Metellus and the arrival of Marius (Sall. *Iug.* 86.4–5, Plut. *Mar.* 10.1).

[5] For the dispute about the date cf. *MRR* 3. 145–6. Some date it after Scaevola's consulship in 95 (thus Münzer, *RE* 1A. 1273, followed by Badian, *Athenaeum* 34 (1956), 104–12); but there are strong arguments for a date in the early 90s: R. Kallet-Marx, *CPh* 84 (1989), 305–12; J.-L. Ferrary, *Chiron* 30 (2000), 163–5.

Rome—he stayed only nine months—Rutilius, continuing Scaevola's policy, earned the bitter enmity of the *publicani* for his actions in protecting the interests of the provincials. Some years after his return[6] he was convicted by an equestrian jury on a charge of *repetundae* (extortion),[7] and retired into exile in the very province he had been accused of wronging. Settling initially in Mytilene, he avoided the massacre of Romans and Italians ordered by Mithridates in 88 by wearing Greek dress (Cic. *Rab. Post.* 27, Dio fr. 95; cf. Athen. 213B=Posidonius *FGrHist* 87 F36.50), and then took up residence in Smyrna. In 85 Sulla employed him to negotiate with Fimbria (App. *Mith.* 60.246), but he declined Sulla's invitation to return to Rome with him (Ovid *Pont.* 1.3.63–4, Val. Max. 6.4.4, Sen. *dial.* 1.3.7, *epist.* 24.4, Quint. *inst.* 11.1.13). Cicero visited Rutilius in Smyrna in 78 (Cic. *rep.* 1.13, *Brut.* 85).

Rutilius was a Stoic and a pupil of Panaetius (T1; cf. Cic. *off.* 3.10); he was also a distinguished legal expert and had studied under P. Scaevola (cos. 133), one of the founders of Roman jurisprudence.[8] Cicero saw him as a model of Stoic oratory (T1), but his contempt for rhetorical display and his belief that orators should speak the plain truth proved ineffectual in practice (Cic. *de orat.* 1.227–9). His wife, Livia,[9] was probably the sister of M. Livius Drusus (cos. 112), and therefore the aunt of the tribune of 91, and his sister, Rutilia, was married to M. Aurelius Cotta, father of the consuls of 75, 74, and 65.[10]

Works

Rutilius is said to have devoted his life in Smyrna to the study of literature (T7), and it was very probably there that he wrote his autobiography. If the work was a polemical defence of his public life and conduct, as is widely assumed (though without much direct evidence from the fragments[11]), it would be natural to think that it was composed in the period of his exile. The same is probably true of the *Histories*, if they are indeed a distinct work (see below).

The *De uita sua* is cited nine times by grammarians (Charisius, Diomedes, and Isidore). These are all verbatim fragments (F1–9), and they prove that the work was written in Latin. Two of them (F3, F8) are in the first person, which suggests that Rutilius followed Scaurus in writing a first-person narrative (on this see the introduction to Scaurus, no. 18). The work comprised at least five books (Charisius cites fragments (F1–6) from each of books 1–5), but the form, scope, content, and economy of the work all remain elusive because the fragments in question are so uninformative and none can be placed securely in context (for the problem of the identity of Pompeius in F1 and the possibility of a reference to Lucilius in F3 see

[6] The traditional date of 92 has been challenged by R. Kallet-Marx, who argues for 94 (*Phoenix* 44 (1990), 122–39), while Ferrary suggests 93 (*Chiron* 30 (2000), 164–5 n. 18).

[7] The case achieved notoriety as an example of injustice, and Rutilius became a Roman Socrates (see T1; for other sources *MRR* 2. 8–9).

[8] Cic. *off.* 2.47; on Scaevola see Pomponius, *dig.* 1.2.2.39; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 203.

[9] She lived to the age of 97 (Val. Max. 8.13.6, Pliny *nat.* 7.158).

[10] Cf. Badian, *Studies*, 39 (also stressing Rutilius' connections with the Metelli).

[11] But F1 and F7–8 could well be polemical in tone (see comm. ad locc.), and the unassigned fragments make it clear that he attacked his enemies: e.g. F10, F14, F15.

comm. ad locc.). None of the other fragments can be assigned with certainty to the autobiography, although some if not all probably do, in fact, belong there.

That Rutilius also wrote a work entitled ἱστορίαι (*Histories*) seems to be clearly indicated, first by Plutarch (F10), and secondly by Athenaeus, who twice refers to a history of Rome (T5–6). On one of these occasions (T5) Athenaeus says that the history was written in Greek, which confirms that it was a separate work. Now that we are dealing with two distinct works, we face the question of how they relate to each other and the task of deciding which fragments belong with which. It is conceivable that the Greek work was no more than a translation of the *De uita sua*,[12] but if so ἱστορίαι seems an unlikely title (as opposed to, say, περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου (cf. *FGrHist* 90 T1), or even ὑπομνήματα (*FGrHist* 231 T5–6)), and one would not expect to have fragments referring to events before Rutilius' own lifetime (F11, 12). It is theoretically possible that these belong to digressions in the autobiography,[13] but surely most improbable. But even if they were distinct works, as we believe they were, their contents could have overlapped considerably, and it is plausible to hold, with Peter, that for a Greek readership Rutilius repeated much of what he had written in the autobiography, but added material relating to an earlier period so as to create a work that could be called ἱστορία or ἱστορίαι.[14] If so, it is possible that some fragments, e.g. F10, should be assigned to both works.[15]

Unfortunately, of the nine fragments (Peter missed the two in Granius Licinianus) not clearly assigned to the *De uita sua*, only F10 is explicitly cited from the *Histories*; three others can be categorized as 'unassigned fragments, probably from the *Histories*' (F11–13), but the remaining two certain fragments (14–15) could belong to either (or both) of the two works, and are therefore classed as 'unassigned fragments'. The same is true of the two 'possible fragments' (16–17), if they are rightly ascribed to Rutilius.

Rutilius' work, unlike Scaurus', is thought to have been influential, and to have been widely used by later historians of the period. One of these was Posidonius, a fellow Stoic who had also studied under Panaetius (Cic. *off.* 3.10). It was no doubt through Posidonius that Athenaeus knew of Rutilius' work (T5–6, from passages printed by Jacoby as fragments of Posidonius: *FGrHist* 87 F27, 59); and Diodorus' admiring account of Q. Scaevola's government of Asia (37.5–6) probably goes back to Rutilius via Posidonius.[16] There can be little doubt that Rutilius' autobiography was used by Sallust, especially for the episodes where he himself plays a part (e.g.

[12] Which is presumably what Badian ('Early historians', 24) intends by saying that 'they (sc. the two works) may even be identical'; Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 663 n. 110; 665) speaks of 'essentially the same work in both Latin and Greek', while Hendrickson (*CPh* 28 (1933), 166–7) envisages only minor additions in the Greek version.

[13] Thus Badian, 'Early historians', 24. It is not clear (at least to us) why Lewis thinks these fragments 'have possible or certain autobiographical relevance' (*ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 662 n. 110).

[14] Pais (*Dalle guerre puniche* (1918), 65) thought it possible that the autobiography was adapted from the Greek work.

[15] Thus Chassignet prints it twice, once under the *Historiae* ((*hist.*) F4) and again under the *De uita sua* ((*dvs*) F13). Her own rules of organization have forced Chassignet to divide Rutilius into two separate entries (abbreviated here for purposes of concordance as *hist.* (=*Historiae*) and *dvs* (=*De uita sua*)). She has our sympathy. But an unfortunate effect is that she is also compelled to decide where to place the unassigned fragments, with potentially misleading results.

[16] For further possibilities see Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 664 nn. 114–15.

Iug. 48.3–53),[17] and by Appian, directly or indirectly, in his account of the Numantine War (*Ib.* 84.363–98.427)[18] and in parts of his narrative of the Mithridatic War (e.g. *Mith.* 60.246). Pais suggested that information about his activities in Licinianus and Valerius Maximus is also derived from the works of Rutilius.[19] In a bold and imaginative reconstruction Badian detects the hand of Rutilius behind Sallust's admiring portrait of Metellus and his hostile caricature of Scaurus.[20] He also holds him partly responsible for the hostile portrayal of Marius in the surviving sources, and for much of the tradition about his own trial and condemnation. Cicero sometimes reports (or makes speakers in his dialogues report) conversations with Rutilius in person; but this has been seen as a convention of the dialogue form, and the information as deriving, in fact, from the autobiography. This is likely enough, but by no means certain; we have therefore decided not to follow Jacoby and Chassignet in printing such passages as fragments of Rutilius.[21]

(CJS)

[17] Thus Münzer, *RE* 1A. 1277; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 122.

[18] The account of the cavalry action led by Rutilius at App. *Ib.* 88.382 is printed by Chassignet as a fragment ((*dvs*) F11); it is true that he is the likely source of this passage and of much else besides in Appian. But Appian's description of Rutilius as 'the historian of these events' (*συγγραφέα τῶνδε τῶν ἔργων*) is inserted because he is mentioned by name here as a participant in the action (cf. Thuc. 4.104.4), not because this particular section of the narrative is taken from him. On balance it has seemed best to us to follow Jacoby and to cite the passage as a testimonium (T4).

[19] Pais, *Dalle guerre puniche* (1918), 76–9. The passages in question are Gran. Lic. 33.25–7 (emergency measures after Arausio); Val. Max. 2.3.2 (introduction of gladiatorial training for soldiers: note the characteristic phrase *nullius ante se imperatoris exemplum secutus*, and cf. F7 and App. *Ib.* 85.369); 2.10.5 (the exiled Rutilius received by the province of Asia); 6.4.4 (Rutilius' Socratic refusal to do anything wrong or unlawful; cf. Seneca, *ben.* 6.37.2).

[20] 'Early historians', 24–5.

[21] Cic. *Brut.* 85–8 is reproduced as F18 'unsicheres' in Jacoby, F10 (*dvs*) in Chassignet. The same reasoning could be applied to *de orat.* 1.227–31, and that passage is indeed attributed to one of Rutilius' written works by Hendrickson (*CPh* 28 (1933), 160–3; *AJPh* 27 (1906), 193–4). The fact that in T1 Cicero makes no reference to the autobiography, though he has just mentioned that of Scaurus (18 T1a) and later refers to that of Catulus (20 T1), is puzzling, but does not require us to believe, with Hendrickson, that Cicero did not know it (*CPh* 28 (1933), 168–9; cf. Douglas on Cic. *Brut.* 114).

22

L. Cornelius Sulla

Editions: Peter 1[2]. cclxx–cclxxx, 195–204; Chassignet 3. xcix–civ, 172–84.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), 57–9; G. Busolt, 'Quellenkritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Revolutionszeit', *NJPhP* 141 (1890), 321–49, 405–38, at 421–38; C. Vitelli, 'Note ed appunti sull'autobiografia di L. Cornelio Silla', *SIFC* 6 (1898), 353–94; F. Frohlich, 'L. Cornelius (392) Sulla Felix', *RE*, 4 (1901), 1522–66; Peter, *Wahrheit und Kunst* (1911), 300–1; F. Leo, 'Die römische Poesie in der sullanischen Zeit', *Hermes* 49 (1914), 161–95, at 164–6 (=*Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Rome, 1960), 1. 249–82, at 252–4); Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 328; J. Carcopino, *Sylla, ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris, 1931), 231–8; G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie*[3] (Bern, 1949; 1st edn., 1907), 246–8, 254–8 (=*A History of Autobiography in Antiquity* (London, 1950), 236–8, 244–8); I. Calabi, 'I commentarii di Silla come fonte storica', *MAL* ser. 8, 3 (1950), 245–302; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'Sulla Felix', *JRS* 41 (1951), 1–10; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 149–57; E. Valgiglio, *Silla e la crisi repubblicana* (Florence, 1956); E. Badian, 'Waiting for Sulla', *JRS* 52 (1962), 47–61 (=*Studies* (1964), 206–34); Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 25; B. W. Frier, 'Sulla's propaganda: the collapse of the Cinnan republic', *AJPh* 92 (1971), 585–604; E. Valgiglio, 'L'autobiografia di Silla nelle biografie di Plutarco, *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 245–81; G. Pascucci, 'I "commentarii" di Silla', *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 283–96; A. Keaveney, 'Sulla, the Marsi, and the Hirpini', *CPh* 76 (1981), 292–6; R. G. Lewis, 'Sulla's autobiography: scope and economy', *Athenaeum* 79 (1991), 509–19; E. S. Ramage, 'Sulla's propaganda', *Klio* 73 (1991), 93–121, esp. 95–9; H. Behr, *Die Selbstdarstellung Sullas: ein aristokratischer Politiker zwischen persönlichen Führungsanspruch und Standessolidarität* (Frankfurt a.M., 1993); Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 454; P. Scholz, 'Sullas *commentarii*: eine literarische Rechtfertigung', in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG* (2003), 172–95; A. Keaveney, *Sulla: The Last Republican* (2nd edn., London, 2005); C. J. Smith, 'Sulla's *Memoirs*', in C. J. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (Swansea, 2009), 65–85; A. Thein, '*Felicitas* and the Memoirs of Sulla and Augustus', ibid. 87–109; T. P. Wiseman, 'Augustus, Sulla, and the supernatural', ibid. 111–23; J. Tatum, 'The late republic', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 161–87, at 163–74.

INTRODUCTION

Life

L. Cornelius Sulla (he assumed the additional *cognomen* 'Felix' in 82 or 81[1]) was born in 138 BC; a patrician, he belonged to a branch of the Cornelii which had fallen on hard times, but in his youth he inherited a fortune from his stepmother and from Nicopolis, a lover (Plut. *Sull.* 2.7–8). He served under Marius in the Jugurthine War (quaestor in 107, *pro quaestore* in 106, and *pro praetore* in 105, when he received the surrender of Jugurtha at the hands of Bocchus, king of Mauretania). In 104 and 103

[1] See Balsdon, *JRS* 41 (1951), 4, for the date.

he again served under Marius' command, this time in Gaul (*legatus* in 104, military tribune in 103). In 102 and 101, however, he was a *legatus* under Q. Lutatius Catulus in northern Italy (F7–9).

The date of Sulla's praetorship (he stood unsucessfully for 98 (F10)) and the first year of his subsequent command in Cilicia are much disputed, the alternatives being 97–96 and 95–94.[2] In either case he probably remained in Cilicia until 92, when he restored Ariobarzanes to the throne of Cappadocia. At the time of his return Bocchus recalled Sulla's success in securing the surrender of Jugurtha by presenting a statue group of the scene to the senate (see comm. on F7).

After distinguished service in the Social War, Sulla was elected consul for 88, and was appointed to the command against Mithridates; when the tribune P. Sulpicius Rufus transferred the command to Marius, Sulla fled to his army, marched on Rome, and seized the city, thus regaining his command (F16–18). Marius managed to escape, but Sulpicius was hunted down and killed. The negative portrait of Sulpicius in the sources will owe something to Sulla's account in his memoirs. After settling affairs in the city, Sulla set off for the East and the war against Mithridates.

In 87 Marius returned at the head of an army, and he and his followers, including the consul Cinna, seized the city in their turn, murdered their opponents, and declared Sulla a public enemy. When Marius died in 86 L. Valerius Flaccus succeeded him both as consul and as commander against Mithridates, and led an army to the East later in the year. Flaccus was murdered, however, in a mutiny led by his own *legatus* C. Flavius Fimbria, who took over the army and crossed from Greece to Asia Minor where he campaigned successfully against Mithridates' forces. Fimbria would have captured the king himself if Sulla's naval commander, Lucullus, had not allowed him to escape by sea.

Meanwhile Sulla, who had campaigned successfully in Greece in 86, capturing Athens and winning victories at Chaeronea and Orchomenus (F4, 19–22), hastened to make peace with Mithridates in 85 (the inconclusive 'Treaty of Dardanus'; cf. F23 and comm.). This enabled him to turn on Fimbria, who was deserted by his troops and committed suicide. Sulla then proceeded to restore Nicomedes and Ariobarzanes to the thrones of Bithynia and Cappadocia respectively, and to reorganize the province of Asia, which he punished by billeting his soldiers on the cities.

After the failure of negotiations with the senate in 84, Sulla opted for armed rebellion, invaded Italy late in 83, and once again marched on the city, which fell to him after the decisive battle of the Colline Gate in 82 (F24–6). There followed a general massacre of the Marians, eventually regularized by the proscriptions, and Sulla's appointment as dictator to reconstitute the state. After celebrating a triumph he enacted laws to reform the senate, the magistracies, and the lawcourts, and to restrict the powers and standing of the tribunes of the plebs. He became consul for a second time in 80, probably after resigning the dictatorship.[3] He retired into private life at the beginning of 79, and died early in 78.

[2] For the arguments see *MRR* 3. 73–4, and the detailed study of T. C. Brennan, *Chiron* 22 (1992), 103–58, arguing for the urban praetorship in 97, and the command in Cilicia—probably *pro consule*—from 96 to 92.

[3] E. Badian, *Historia* 11 (1962), 230; *Athenaeum* 48 (1970), 8–14. The issue has recently been re-examined in detail by A. Keaveney (*Athenaeum* 93 (2005), 423–39), who believes that Sulla resigned the dictatorship before the end of 81.

Sulla's career created bitter and profound tensions that lasted to the end of the republic. His memoirs played a big part in the ensuing debate.

Work[4]

Sulla was working on his memoirs until the end of his life (F6), and the work was completed by his freedman Epicadus (T4), just as Hirtius completed Caesar's *commentarii*.[5]

As far as we can tell, the work was arranged chronologically. When Plutarch gives a title,[6] it is (with the exception of αἱ αὐτοῦ πράξεις in F1) ὑπομνήματα; Cicero (F16) uses *historia*, Gellius (F2–3) *res gestae*, Suetonius (T4) and Priscian (F4) *res suae* (the equivalent of αἱ αὐτοῦ πράξεις); no one uses *commentarii* or *de uita sua*, as might have been expected.[7] To circumvent the problem, we talk of 'memoirs'.

The work was dedicated to Lucullus (F1), to whom Sulla did not hesitate to give advice (F14). Book 2 mentioned the first Cornelius to have the *cognomen* 'Sulla', in the mid-third century BC (F2), but this probably occurred in a digression (cf. comm. ad loc.), rather than as part of a lengthy introduction on his background and ancestry occupying the best part of two whole books.[8]

The aftermath of the battle of Chaeronea came in book 10 (F5), while from F6 we know that book 22 was the last, and therefore the one which Epicadus revised and completed (T4). It cannot be assumed, however, that the arrangement of material was even, and it is impossible to tell what degree of detail Sulla gave to his dictatorship.[9] Calabi[10] even suggested that the work did not reach as far as Sulla's death, but stopped well before then. Her conclusion that the work was primarily concerned with military and diplomatic matters may well be right;[11] one ought to add the deep overlay of religious symbolism and portentous prophecy that is clear at every stage.

Plutarch cites the memoirs explicitly on eleven occasions (F1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 18–20, 23, 26; the reference in F12, 13, 15 is implicit; in F7–10, 21–2, 24–5 he refers only to

[4] The verbatim citations in F2, 3, and 5 demonstrate that Sulla wrote in Latin: there is not the slightest evidence for thinking that these come from a translation of a work originally written in Greek (cf. comm. on F1). It is of no relevance that the freedman who completed the memoirs (see below) was Greek, since he also wrote a work on Roman *cognomina* (Charis. 140). See Valgiglio, *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 245–51, attempting (249–51) to identify passages where Plutarch's language has been influenced by Latin expressions.

[5] In T4 Suetonius uses language almost identical with that of *Iul.* 56.1.

[6] He does not do so in F7–10, 21–2, 24–5.

[7] Cf. Pascucci, *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 293–6, Valgiglio, ibid. 251–6.

[8] As supposed by E. Badian, *Lucius Sulla, the Deadly Reformer* (Sydney, 1970), 4; *Arethusa* 1 (1968), 41 n. 6: 'the scale of Sulla's treatment of the earliest period (including, presumably, legendary descent) must have been enormous.' A different explanation has been offered by Lewis, *Athenaeum* 79 (1991), 509–19, who suggests that book 1 was a long introduction, concerned especially with Sulla's *felicitas*, and that the autobiography proper began in book 2.

[9] If F5 refers to the battle of the Colline Gate (see commentary ad loc.), there will be little room for the dictatorship.

[10] *MAL* ser. 8.3 (1950), 5. 249–52, citing differences between the accounts of Sulla's last days in Plutarch and Appian.

[11] Calabi, *MAL* ser. 8.3 (1950), 5. 302.

Sulla), and on two occasions (F4, 6) he gives a book number, which he appears to do only when he has the work to hand.[12]

Once we accept that Plutarch used the memoirs directly, it is reasonable to ask how much more of the information given in the lives of Sulla, Marius, and Lucullus comes from them. For the life of Sulla, it has been estimated that almost two-thirds may derive from the memoirs, in particular the various references to dreams,[13] visions, and Sulla's own speeches.[14]

Any discussion of the Sullan element in Plutarch's life, and indeed in all ancient references to Sulla, is complicated by the fact that Sulla's memoirs were not the only tendentious account of the period (see below). On the other hand, Plutarch (F11–15) makes it clear that Sulla repeatedly stressed the part of fortune and providence in his career, and indeed it is clear that his priestly activities (he was an augur, and, probably, a pontifex as well) and his temple-building were a central part of his propaganda.[15] Consequently, it would not be surprising if much more of the material on dreams and portents, some of which is explicitly attributed to the memoirs, came from this source. In F6 Plutarch cites Sulla for the prediction of Chaldaean seers, and this makes it likely that *Sull.* 5.11, where Plutarch describes the meeting, also derives from the memoirs; if so, one might wonder if the whole account of the visit to the Euphrates comes from Sulla. On the other hand, Plutarch notes differing reactions to the humiliation of the Parthians, which indicates that the story was told more than once. Chapter 7 of the *Sulla* is full of omens and portents; 9.6–8 relates the same omen that we find in F16 and adds another, that a goddess whom Plutarch identifies as Cybele, Luna, Minerva, or Bellona, appeared to encourage him further. But Plutarch puts the omen just before the march on Rome in 88, Cicero at the siege of Nola during the Social War. It may have been Sulla who recounted the strange story of the discovery of a satyr (*Sull.* 27.3–4), while the story of Sulla's infancy at *uir. ill.* 75.1, where an old woman approaches his nurse, proclaims that the child would be *tibi et rei publicae tuae felix*, and disappears, might very well be an omen that Plutarch chose to omit.

There are a number of references to Sulla's words: the famous appeal to the troops at *Sull.* 21.3 (cf. *Frontin.* strat. 2.8.12, Polyaen. 8.9.2, App. *Mith.* 49.195, Amm. 16.12.41); the dismissal of the verbose Athenians at *Sull.* 13.5, and the exchange between Sulla and Archelaus in *Sull.* 22 both strike a good Roman note; Sulla's total dominance of the situation comes across well in his meeting with Mithridates at *Sull.* 24.1–6; *Crass.* 6.4 could come from Sulla's account of men's reasons for following him on the second march on Rome. It is possible that Sulla's demand for the treasures of Delphi and the correspondence with Caphis (*Sull.* 12) derive from documents which Sulla copied into his memoirs. Finally, there can be little doubt that Sulla went out of

[12] Cf. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 83.

[13] On Sulla's dreams cf. Kragelund, *Historia* 50 (2001), 92–5.

[14] Valgiglio, *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 275–81. Calabi denied that Plutarch used the memoirs themselves except for a couple of points of detail; even Valgiglio (*StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 258–9), worried by the length of the memoirs, suggested the possibility of a summary or extracts. Even if Plutarch did not use the memoirs directly, it can scarcely be doubted that they were the ultimate source of much of his material.

[15] There is much argument about the precise meaning of Sulla's coin issues, but it is not denied that they represent a propaganda connection between his priestly offices and his political self-justification. See Keaveney, *AJAH* 7 (1982), 150–71, with references to the debate between Frier (*ANSMusN* 13 (1967), 111–18; *Arethusa* 2 (1969), 187–99) and Badian (*Arethusa* 1 (1968), 26–46; 2 (1969), 199–201). See also Hurlet, *La Dictature de Sylla* (Brussels, 1993), 109–33, on the religious dimension in the dictatorship.

his way to denigrate his enemies, and one of the clearest instances of this is Cinna's betrayal. The oath which Cinna took and then broke, related at *Sull.* 10.6–8, could usefully be adduced to blacken the defiant consul[16] (see further below).

The details of the influence of Sulla on the later tradition were explored at length by Badian.[17] It is clear that one can trace a systematic denigration of the three years in which Cinna held Rome, and this account seems to have found its way into Livy,[18] and thence to Orosius and Eutropius.

Badian holds that much of Appian's material comes from the memoirs, but here the problem is more acute than it is with Plutarch. Appian never cites Sulla, and may have taken his material from an intermediate source.[19] It is notable that Appian cites documents from Sulla's hand more often than Plutarch. One example is the letter which Appian says that Sulla wrote to L. Valerius Flaccus urging the reintroduction of the dictatorship.[20] Another is the letter setting out Sulla's position and demands before his invasion of Italy (*b.c.* 1.77). Frier[21] detects a persistent anti-Sullan line in Appian, but it remains possible that Badian[22] is right to derive the documents from Sulla himself, Frier right to see Appian's hostility, from whatever source.

Given the length of the memoirs, and the possibility, as we have seen, that much of the work was concerned with details of topography, battles, diplomatic manoeuvres, and the intervention of the supernatural, and the likelihood of a significant post-Sullan apologetic (in which Sisenna might be a major figure[23]), it would not be surprising if the various surviving sources had looked for, and taken, different things from different parts of this large tradition. It is worth noting that Augustine (*CD* 2.24) devoted an entire, reasonably accurate, chapter to the favourable omens that had attended Sulla's career, but concluded that they represented the work not of the gods, but of wicked demons who failed to correct his descent into vicious behaviour.

It is generally the case, however, that Sulla receives a good press in surviving sources until he becomes dictator, at which point the horror of the proscriptions takes over. Laffi[24] has suggested that a pro-Caesarian historiography began to redress the balance that had been so decisively swung by the combination of Sulla's memoirs and his ruthless suppression of opposition. If Sulla himself took less trouble to excuse his actions as dictator than to justify the means by which he rose to power, there may have been even more space for criticism; but Sulla's portrayal of his divinely assisted and deeply patriotic defence of the troubled republic was not effectively challenged in surviving ancient historiography.

(CJS)

[16] See Frier, *AJPh* 92 (1971), 585–604. [17] *Studies*, 206–34.

[18] As Balsdon observed (*JRS* 55 (1965), 231), some of Badian's account depends on a positive evaluation of the reliability of the *periochae* of Livy.

[19] See W. Ensslin, *Klio* 20 (1926), 425–65.

[20] *b.c.* 1.98; H. Bellen, *Historia* 24 (1975), 555–69. Balsdon (*JRS* 41 (1951), 5 n. 53) took the γραφή of App. *b.c.* 1.97.452 to be a Greek source, but Bellen suggests that it was a Latin source that took the documents from Sulla's memoirs.

[21] *AJPh* 92 (1971), 593 n. 47. [22] *Studies*, 228–9. [23] Cf. introduction to Sisenna, I. 308–9.

[24] *Athenaeum* 45 (1967), 177–213, 255–77. Sallust (*Iug.* 95.3–4, *hist.* 1.55.5 (Lepidus' speech)) offers a clue. It would be interesting to know if Sallust derived any of his military and topographical details in *Iug.* from the memoirs (on the speech of Bocchus at *Iug.* 110 see Sensal, *LEC* 69 (2001), 65–74); the defence of the proscriptions as mild in [Sall.] *rep.* 2.4.1 is, of course, of no relevance to Sallust himself; see Syme, *Sallust*, 341.

23

L. Licinius Lucullus

Editions: Peter 1^2. cclxxxi–cclxxxii; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 185; G. S. Bucher, *BNJ* 185.

Principal discussions: M. Gelzer, 'L. Licinius (104) Lucullus', *RE* 13 (1926), 376–414, esp. 412; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 327; A. Keaveney, *Lucullus: A Life* (London, 1992), 9–10; E. Badian, 'L. Licinius Lucullus', *OCD*^{4} 834.

INTRODUCTION

Life

L. Licinius Lucullus was the grandson of a consul by the same name, and nephew of Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus. He was one of Sulla's key supporters, and served under him in the Social War and as his (pro)quaestor in the First Mithridatic War. Sulla dedicated his memoirs to him in 78, the year of his praetorship. Consul in 74, Lucullus gained the command against Mithridates the following year. His military operations were successful, and he imposed a fair settlement on the province of Asia, before being replaced by Pompey in 66. A leading opponent of Pompey and Caesar, he was sidelined after the formation of the compact between them and Crassus in 60, and devoted the rest of his life to philosophy and luxurious living. A major intellectual figure, he was renowned as a devotee and patron of art and literature.

Work

We know of only one historical work, a youthful enterprise on the Social War, in Greek, undertaken as a result of a lottery (T4). Cicero made Lucullus speak in praise of History (T2), and elsewhere says that he was sufficiently confident in his command of Greek to introduce some deliberate mistakes into his 'histories' (T1). This would point to a historical work written in Greek as a *jeu d'esprit*, and therefore probably to the same account of the Social War. Cicero knew it, then, and Plutarch claims that it survived (T4), but it left no other trace that we can see. Doubts have been expressed about its authorship, and even its existence (e.g. M. H. Crawford, in P. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1978), 205 and n. 75), but such scepticism is unjustified (Keaveney, *Lucullus*, 210 n. 30). Sulla evidently implied that his own memoirs could have been improved by Lucullus (T3=Sulla 22 T2a, F1), and some have thought (surely wrongly) that he actually did so (T. F. Carney, *SO* 36 (1960), 91–2; R. G. Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 630 n. 2 and 665 n. 119, suggests that Lucullus fulfilled Sulla's commission to publish his memoirs and translate them into Greek). For the conceit that carefully drafted work was merely notes for someone else to write up, see ibid. 637.

(CJS)

24

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius

Editions: Peter 1[2], cclxxxv–cccix, 205–37; Chassignet 3, xxiii–xxxviii, 13–49, 186–93; Beck-Walter 2, 109–67; S. Laconi, *Q. Claudii Quadrigarii annalium reliquiae* (Rome 2005); M. Ambrosetti, *Q. Claudio Quadrigario Annali: introduzione, edizione critica e commento* (Rome, 2009).

Principal discussions (for works dealing solely with F6 see comm. ad loc.): Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen* (1863), 39–41; T. Plüss, 'Zu Q. Claudius Quadrigarius', *NJPhP* 41 (1871), 66–8, 287–9; Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* (1898), 1. 176; 178; B. Niese, 'Q. Claudius (308) Quadrigarius', *RE* 3 (1899), 2858–61; E. Wölfflin, 'Die Sprache des Claudius Quadrigarius', *ALLG* 15 (1908), 10–22; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 133–4; B. Sypniewska, 'De Claudii Quadrigarii fragmentis ab A. Gellio traditis quaestiones selectae', in *Charisteria Morawski* (Krakow, 1922), 149–89; Schanz-Hosius 1[3] (1927), 316–18; M. Zimmerer, *Der Annalist Qu. Claudius Quadrigarius* (Munich, 1937); A. Klotz, 'Der Annalist Q. Claudius Quadrigarius', *RhM* 91 (1942), 268–85; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 18–21, 34–5; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 227–61; D. Timpe, 'Erwägungen zur jüngeren Annalistik', *A&A* 25 (1979), 97–119; Courtney, *ALP* (1999), 144–52; M. Ambrosetti, 'Sull' uso delle figure di suono negli annales di Claudio Quadrigario', *RCCM* 42 (2000), 7–28; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 48–51.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The direct evidence for the date of Q. Claudius Quadrigarius consists only of the passage of Velleius (T4 = GT 4) which says that Claudius, Rutilius Rufus, and Valerius Antias were contemporaries of Sisenna.[1] Although, as in the case of Antias,[2] Cicero never mentions Claudius (if, as is argued earlier,[3] we reject the view that he is the Clodius of *leg.* 1.6), no one has ever doubted that he wrote, or, at least, was still writing in the years that followed the death of Sulla. That, perhaps, is because, while there is no fragment of Antias that refers to an event later than 91 BC, we know that Claudius dealt with events of 87 in book 19 and described the battle of Sacriportus in 82 (F88), while book 23 is the last for which we have evidence. We have followed Peter in placing Claudius before Valerius Antias—the order, for what this is worth, in which Velleius (T4) mentions them—but it is perfectly possible that it was Antias who wrote first.

The historian's *cognomen* is unique, his *praenomen* very rare for a Claudius, being attested only for the tribune of 218 and the praetor of 208 (if these are not in fact the same man[4]) and a senator who appears in the *s.c. de agro Pergameno*.[5] He is scarcely

[1] See 1. 306 n. 2. [2] See 1. 58, 295. [3] 1. 264–5. [4] Cf. *MRR* 1. 294 n. 1.

[5] Sherk, *RDGE* 12, lines 31–2 (the square brackets indicate only that the *nomen*, filiation, and tribe are missing on the Smyrna copy of the inscription). On the date of the inscription see introduction to Aufidius, 1. 266.

likely to have been a patrician, and perhaps he or one of his ancestors owed their citizenship to the initiative of a Claudius.[6]

Work

Claudius deviated from his predecessors (except, of course, Coelius Antipater and those who dealt only with contemporary history) in not beginning his history with the origins of Rome; he started instead with the Gallic invasion and occupation of Rome in 390.[7] Even if the *Κλώδιός τις* of Paulus Clodius 16 F1 is not our writer,[8] the arguments of that work could clearly have served to undermine confidence in the possibility of writing the history of the period before 390.[9] What is more, the facts that Livy began his sixth book with an echo of Clodius' arguments,[10] and that six fragments of Quadrigarius (F1, 2, 22, 24, 27, 28) find parallels in Livy's narrative in book 5, allow the supposition that Quadrigarius repeated Clodius' arguments at the beginning of his history.[11]

Aulus Gellius and Nonius Marcellus, the two principal sources of our fragments of Quadrigarius, as well as Priscian on three occasions, Servius (DS), Macrobius, and Diomedes once each, call the work *Annales*, while Priscian and Diomedes, once each, call it *Historiae*: we may safely conclude that the former title is the correct one.[12]

Claudius' first book contained events from the Gallic invasion until, at least, 311 or, if F34 belongs to 306, to that year,[13] a considerably longer period than any of those that followed. None of the fragments cited from book 2 can be given a context, but since 278 was treated in book 3 (F41), it is likely that F35, dealing with the year 294, in fact belongs to the former book. Book 2 thus covered, at the most, the years 310 to 279, books 3, which certainly went as far as 258 (F42–3), and 4 (if we are right to assign F50 to Hannibal's crossing of the Alps) at the least 278 to 218. The difference between the maximum of twenty-six years (301 is a 'dictator year') for book 2 and the minimum average of thirty and a half years for books 3 and 4 is not all that great, though the latter will have contained the whole of the First Punic War as well as the outbreak of the Second War.[14] Book 5 probably contained the events from Hannibal's arrival in Italy until the end of 214, since the election of the consuls of 213 was in

[6] He cannot himself have been a freedman, since he was considerably earlier than Otacilius Pitholaus (33), the first freedman historian.

[7] It is not stated that he began in 390. But since the fragments of book 1 cover the period from then until, at the earliest, 311 (see below) and reasons for that starting-point are discernible, it is hypersceptical to express doubt on the matter (as was done by Zimmerer, *Quadrigarius*, 8–9).

[8] See I. 264–5.

[9] And Quadrigarius might have been particularly influenced by the views of another Clau(o)dius.

[10] Cf. Oakley, *Comm.* I. 381–2.

[11] Peter (cclxxvi–cclxxxviii) had the fanciful notion that the Claudii had instructed Quadrigarius to begin in 390 in order to detract from the glory of the Fabii, whose deeds in the fifth century abounded in the history of Fabius Pictor. We may note that Claudius seems to have described the activities of a third-century Fabius in some detail (F46). F57 could be regarded as not portraying the Cunctator in a good light.

[12] On Nonius' use of *annali libro* followed by the book number see I. 95.

[13] See comm. on F17 and 34.

[14] Livy's distribution, although on a much larger scale, is not dissimilar: books 10–13 contained 303 to 278, books 14–20, 278 to 219.

book 6 (F57); one can hardly doubt that F58, dealing with an event of 211, also belongs to that book.

For the second century no fragment with a certain or plausible context has a book number until 137, when F77 is cited from book 9, but since books 6–9 cover a minimum of seventy-seven years, the treatment was obviously very selective (Livy took approximately thirty-one books to cover the same period);[15] the citations from Livy show that some events were treated at length; others will have been omitted entirely. It is scarcely likely that Claudius was still in book 6 in 197 (F63), and we have therefore placed all the fragments cited by Livy, together with F70–1, cited by Orosius, under the heading 'books 7–9'.[16]

The pace slackens somewhat for the rest of the second century, since the exile of Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus in 100, or his return in 98, occurred in book 13 (F78).[17] The next two decades, however, when Claudius was writing as a contemporary historian, received much fuller treatment. By 87 Claudius had advanced to book 19 and he wrote at least twenty-three books. It is most unlikely that he devoted the rest of book 19 to the First Mithridatic War, the Civil War, the dictatorship of Sulla, and the beginning of the Sertorian War, and for that reason Peter cannot have been right to take F83, from book 19, to refer to the Sertorian War and assign F88, referring to the battle of Sacriportus, to book 19.[18]

In only one case can anything positive be said about the sources used by Quadrigarius. In F58 Livy says that Claudius 'translated the history of Acilius from Greek into Latin' and in F66 that Claudius' story of the conversation between Scipio Africanus and Hannibal followed Acilius. It is disputed whether all that is ascribed to Claudius in F58 in fact stood in Acilius,[19] and it certainly does not follow that Claudius published a translation of Acilius' work; he may merely have indicated that he was following Acilius.[20]

[15] 'The fact that Claudius is not cited for the trials of the Scipios does not mean that his "lack of interest in politics and personalities is phenomenal" (Badian, 'Early historians', 19). On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the great majority of fragments that can be given an identifiable context refer to wars or external events (cf. Cornell in G. Zecchini (ed.), *'Partiti' e fazioni nell'esperienza politica romana* (Milan, 2009), 6).

[16] Chassignet (3. xxvii) uncritically accepts Peter's assignment of these fragments to specific books.

[17] See comm. on F78. Badian ('Early historians', 34 n. 89) denied that the fragment referred to the exile of Metellus, on the grounds that 'Claudius could not have filled up four books with events between 99 and the Social War . . . a period to which Livy allots two', and suggests that it belongs to the trial of Metellus for *repetundae* (Cic. *Att.* 1.16.4, *Balb.* 11), which he places *c.*107; Münzer (*RE* 3. 1218) and Broughton (*MRR* 1. 539 n. 3) more plausibly put it after his praetorship. In fact Livy described the return of Metellus in book 69, the events of 90 (to which F82, from book 18, belongs) in book 73.

[18] Cf. Zimmerer, *Quadrigarius*, 8; see further commentary on F83, 88, and 90. Badian ('Early historians', 18) thinks there may have been twenty-four books, 'going down to about 70'; at *Studies*, 211–12, he agrees with Peter's assignment of F88 to book 19 and implies that F90 comes from a speech by Lepidus: this is part of his argument that, the Mithridatic War apart, Quadrigarius did not deal with the 80s in detail and was not Livy's source for the politics of the period. Beck–Walter (2. 161) take this argument to extremes, by suggesting that book 19 extended as late as 72 BC, which seems impossible to us.

[19] See comm. on Acilius 7 F3 and Piso 9 F34.

[20] See Briscoe, *Comm.* 2. 165. Refutation of those who have held that the Claudius of these two fragments is not Claudius Quadrigarius is otiose (Briscoe l.c.; further bibliography in Chassignet 3. xxxi n. 159). The scale of Claudius' treatment of the period from 200 to 167 does not justify Badian's claim ('Early historians', 19) that he 'did not discover Polybius'. For bibliography on the matter see Chassignet 3. xxxii n. 160.

Although, as in the case of other writers used by Livy, it is misguided to attempt to define those parts of his narrative which derive from Claudius,[21] it can be regarded as certain that F6 was Livy's source for his description of the single combat of Manlius and the Gaul, and the correspondences between F1–2, 22, 24, 27–8, and Livy's account of the Gallic Sack, and F17 and Livy 9.31.15, make it very probable that he is Livy's source in those passages as well;[22] in addition, there are good reasons for thinking that Quadrigarius was Livy's source for the alternative version of Scipio Africanus' trial and death at 38.56.3–9, and his main source for his account of Numa's books at 40.29.3–14;[23] it appears moreover that he had Eumenes, not his brother Attalus, coming to Rome in 172 (see comm. on Antias 26 F60). As is argued in the introduction to Valerius Antias,[24] however, the limited scale of Claudius' treatment of the middle republic, together with the fact that in F57 Claudius moved directly from the election of the consuls of 213 to the anecdote about one of the consuls, Q. Fabius Maximus, and his father, the Cunctator, indicates that the regular annalistic details found in Livy derive from Antias, not from Claudius. Differences between Livy and fragments of Claudius cited by other authors enable us to conclude that the latter was not the former's source at 10.32–7; 23.46.12–47.8; 24.44.9–10; or 25.18.4–15 (see comm. on F35, 56, and 57).

The citations by Livy allow us to see the nature and scale of Claudius' errors and inventions. In F57 he makes the Cunctator a proconsul, when he was in fact a *legatus* to his son; he apparently, like Antias, had two invented clauses in the peace treaty with Philip V, stated that there was specific provision that Philip should not make war on Eumenes of Pergamum, gave figures for the indemnity payable which were far further from the truth than those of Antias, and wrongly stated that hostages were delivered on conclusion of the peace (F64); in F67 he gave higher casualty figures than Antias (as he had in F58) and wrongly placed the second battle against the Galatians, like the first, on Mt Olympus. In F69, as, probably, did Antias, he told a totally false story about a Rhodian embassy demanding that Rome and Perseus make peace, and alone claimed that as a response the senate freed Lycia and Caria from Rhodian control, whereupon the leader of the Rhodian delegation collapsed. (When the same falsification stood in both Claudius and Antias, the probability is that the invention was due to an earlier writer; but it cannot be excluded that one used the other.)

F78, 86, and, probably, 89 indicate a hostile attitude to the Marians, though F90 could be criticism of Sulla put into the mouth of a Marian.[25] F23, 26, 60, 86, 90, 91, and 95 contain direct speech, though F23, 26, and 91 could be authorial remarks. In F41 Claudius, following Thucydides and followed by Sallust and Livy (*per.* 99),

[21] Cf. I. 85–7, 261, 299; the most recent attempt to do so was that of Zimmerer (*Quadrigarius*, 22–68, 128–61); cf. Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 3 n. 8, 4 n. 1 (=J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.), *Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 464 n. 17, 465 n. 18).

[22] See comm. ad locc.

[23] See Briscoe, *Comm.* 3. 177–8 (trials of the Scipios), and 480 (books of Numa); and cf. comm. on Hemina 6 F35 and Antias 26 F57.

[24] I. 303–4.

[25] Cf. S. Bastian, *AFMC* NS 3 (1978–9), 5–13 and comm. on F66. F25 and 81 cannot be taken as evidence for an optimate position, as is done by Plüss, *NJPhP* 41 (1871), 287.

composes a letter as the equivalent of a speech.[26] Indirect speech is found at F12, 25, and 43.[27]

We have not included Peter's fragment 12 (Gell. 9.11), which there is no reason to regard as the work of Quadrigarius; see Sypniewska in *Charisteria Morawski*, 159–79; Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 251; Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 124, 231 n. 2. We agree with Peter in excluding the passages he discusses on p. cccix.

(JB)

[26] Cf. J. Sykutris, *RE* Suppl. 5. 209.

[27] Zimmerer (*Quadrigarius*, 123) claims that this does not occur before Claudius: see, however, Fabius 1 F20 and Coelius 15 F59; the absence of any other examples may well be an accident of transmission.

25

Valerius Antias

Editions: Peter 1^2. cccv–cccxxxiii, 238–75; Chassignet 3. lxiii–lxxv, 104–50, 225–38; Beck–Walter 2. 168–240.

Principal discussions: H. Liebaldt, *De Valerio Antiate annalium scriptore* (Naumburg, 1840); Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen* (1863), 43–6; Münzer, *De gente Valeria* (1891), esp. 54–71; A. von Gutschmid, 'Aus Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der römischen Historiographie', in *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1894), 5. 526–31; F. Münzer, 'Zu den Fragmenten des Valerius Antias', *Hermes* 32 (1897), 469–74; L. Holzapfel, 'Sull'età di Valerio Anziate', *RSA* 4 (1899), 51–60; F. Münzer, 'Ancora sull'età di Valerio Anziate', *RSA* 4 (1899), 229–33; L. Holzapfel, 'Ancora sull'età di Valerio Anziate', *RSA* 4 (1899), 456–66; C. Zohren, *Valerius Antias und Caesar* (Münster, 1910); H. Volkmann, 'Valerius (98) Antias', *RE* 7A (1948), 2312–40; Ogilvie, *Comm.* (1965), 12–16; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 20–2; J. D. Cloud, 'The date of Valerius Antias', *LCM* 2 (1977), 225–7; Luce, *Livy* (1977), 158–81; D. Timpe, 'Erwägungen zur jüngeren Annalistik', *A&A* 25 (1979), 97–119; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), 104–39; Cornell, 'Formation' (1986); T. Leidig, *Valerius Antias und ein annalistischer Bearbeiter des Polybios als Quellen des Livius vornehmlich für Buch 30 und 31* (Frankfurt, 1994); Oakley, *Comm.* 1 (1997), 89–92, 4 (2005), 491; Rich, 'Structuring Roman history' (1997=2011); Walt, *Macer* (1997), 303–7; Wiseman, *Roman Drama* (1998), 75–89; M. Chassignet, 'Les *Annales* de Valérius Antias: sont-elles une oeuvre d'époque césarienne?', *CEA* 37 (2001), 55–63; G. Forsythe, 'Dating and arranging the Roman History of Valerius Antias', in V. B. Gorman and E. W. Robinson (eds.), *Oikistes: Studies in Honour of A. J. Graham* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 2002), 99–112; U. Walter, 'Opfer ihrer Ungleichzeitigkeit. Die Gesamtgeschichten im ersten Jahrhundert v. Chr. und die fortdauernde Attraktivität des "annalistischen Schemas"', in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG* (2003), 146–7, 152–4; J. W. Rich, 'Valerius Antias and the construction of the Roman past', *BICS* 48 (2005), 137–61; P. Erdkamp, 'Valerius Antias and Livy's casualty reports', in *SLLRH* 13 (2006), 166–182, and 'Late-annalistic battle scenes in Livy (Books 21–44)', *Mnemosyne* 59 (2006), 525–63.

INTRODUCTION

Life

In origin, the Valerii Antiates may have been dependants of the patrician Valerii, owing their *cognomen* to residence at Antium. We hear of only one other member of the family, L. Valerius Antias, said by Livy 23.34.9 to have been put in charge by the fleet commander P. Valerius Flaccus of the five ships escorting the captured Macedonian ambassadors to Rome in 215. Livy may have been following Valerius Antias in this passage, and the historian is often supposed to have invented the naval officer as an ancestor for himself. However, the notice may well be genuine: although there are dubious features in Livy's account of the Macedonian embassy to Hannibal, this part of the story appears circumstantial, and an invented ancestor would perhaps

have been given a more prominent role. L. Valerius Antias may have been serving with Flaccus as a family dependant.[1]

We do not know the *praenomen* of the historian Valerius Antias, or anything about his career or social status. Many regard his work as typical of non-senatorial historical writing, but it is in fact quite uncertain whether he was a senator or not.[2]

Work: date of composition

The ancient evidence represents Antias as an earlier writer than Cicero. While the majority of scholars have accepted this, there has been a good deal of support for a later dating in the 40s BC, either during Caesar's dictatorship or after his death. The case for the later dating was first developed by Holzapfel, Zohren, and Cornelius, and has been revived by Cloud and Wiseman.[3]

Velleius (T6=GT4) includes Antias in the third of his literary excursuses, in which he surveys the Roman writers who flourished in the later second and early first centuries BC (2.9.1–6). Little weight can be placed on Velleius' statement that Antias was a contemporary of Rutilius, Sisenna, and Quadrigarius, since the two whose approximate birth dates are known were born some forty years apart (Rutilius, *c.*160; Sisenna, *c.*120). However, it is not true, as is sometimes claimed, that Velleius' discussion is so vague as to be worthless as a chronological indicator. He makes a clear separation between the writers listed in this excursus and those mentioned in the fourth and final excursus, covering the period from Cicero to Augustus (2.36).[4] The inclusion of Antias in the third excursus thus shows that in Velleius' view he was pre-Ciceronian.

Velleius' testimony is not isolated, as proponents of the late dating claim, but corroborated by two other writers. Asconius' conjecture that Cicero was following Antias in his statement about the introduction of separate senatorial seating in the *Pro Cornelio* (T7=F41) implies that Antias' work (or at least the portion covering the period down to 194) had been published before Cicero delivered that speech in 65 BC. The conjecture is in fact unfounded (see note on F41), but the passage nonetheless shows us that Asconius, like Velleius, thought of Antias as having written before Cicero. Particularly weighty support is provided by the grammarian Flavius Caper, cited by Charisius (T10).[5] Caper in his treatise on Latin usage quoted Antias' use of the adverb *nouissime* to refute Tiro's claim that the word had only come into use in his

[1] For further discussion see e.g. Volkmann, *RE* 7A. 2319, 2340; J. Seibert, *Forschungen zu Hannibal* (Darmstadt, 1993), 244–6.

[2] Non-senatorial: e.g. Gelzer, *Kl. Schr.* 3. 103; Ogilvie, *Comm.* 13; Badian, 'Early historians', 21; Timpe, *A&A* 25 (1979), 107–10; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 75; Beck–Walter 2. 168. *Contra*: Cornell, 'Formation', 79.

[3] Holzapfel, *RSA* 4 (1899), 51–60, 456–66; Zohren, *Valerius Antias u. Caesar* (1910); E. Cornelius, *Untersuchungen zur frühen römischen Geschichte* (Munich, 1940), 20–4; Cloud, *LCM* 2 (1977), 225–7; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 104–39; *Roman Drama*, 75–89. See also now Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 209–24; Walt, *Macer*, 303–7; Forsythe, 'Dating and arranging' (2002); Chassignet, *CEA* 37 (2001), 55–63; Chassignet 3. lxvi–lxxi; Beck–Walter 2 168–9.

[4] The only exceptions are the orators Crassus, Antonius, and Sulpicius, mentioned in both excursuses, but Velleius avoids confusion by stating clearly that they preceded Cicero and Hortensius (2.36.2).

[5] The importance of Caper's evidence is rightly stressed by Volkmann, *RE* 7A. 2318–19. On Flavius Caper (*flor. c.* AD 200) see Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 232–3.

own day. It follows that Caper must have regarded Antias as writing well before the young Tiro became Cicero's secretary in the 50s BC.[6]

The view that Antias lived and wrote before Cicero thus represents the consensus of later Roman literary scholarship. The arguments which have been marshalled for dating the composition of his work to the last years of Cicero's life or even later are not nearly powerful enough to justify the rejection of the consistent testimony of these ancient authorities.

Much has been made of Cicero's omission of Antias in his review of Roman historical writers and their stylistic weaknesses at *leg.* 1.6–7 (GT2). The omission is surprising, but is not to be explained on chronological or (as some hold) social grounds. In so far as Cicero had any principle of selection here, he may just have picked writers whom he felt suited his argument. The result seems to some extent arbitrary: the list includes the obscure Vennonius and Clodius, and omits Acilius, Postumius, Cassius Hemina, Gellius, Rutilius, and Quadrigarius.[7]

It seems unlikely that Cicero was unaware of Antias' history, but what use he made of it (if any) we cannot say. His failure to cite Antias does not mean that he did not use him: it may be merely chance that in his extant works he cites Acilius, Piso, Gellius, and Sisenna once each and Antias not at all.[8] Wiseman (*Clio's Cosmetics*, 104–39) has argued ingeniously that certain anti-Claudian motifs, such as the name of the decemvir who assaulted Verginia and the tale of the drowning of the sacred chickens before the battle of Drepana, only appear in works of Cicero composed in 46–44 because they had been freshly invented in the recently published history of Antias. However, this theory makes implausible assumptions about the extent both of Antias' inventions and of Cicero's credulity. It is much more likely that such tales had long been well-established features of the tradition and do not figure in Cicero's earlier writings either by chance or because of Cicero's wish not to extend his quarrel with Clodius to the whole Claudian family, and in particular the formidable Ap. Claudius Pulcher.[9]

In support of the late dating, features of the annalistic tradition are ascribed to Antias which, it is maintained, must reflect events of the last years of the republic or later.[10]

[6] Charisius' quotation from Caper must include the two citations of Antias: if the quotation were limited to the words 'miror id dixisse Tironem', as with Barwick's punctuation, it would be vacuous. For Tiro's career see 1. 402.

[7] The various explanations of Cicero's selection are discussed by Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 219–23, implausibly concluding that he omitted Antias and Quadrigarius because they were still alive at the time of writing. 'Clodius' is not to be identified with Claudius Quadrigarius (1. 264), but, even if he were, we should still not be obliged to explain the omission of Antias on chronological grounds (*contra* Badian, 'Early historians', 20), in view of the numerous second-century historians omitted from the list.

[8] If Antias was not a senator, there is no reason to think that this would have led Cicero to disregard his work (as Badian, Ogilvie, and Rawson (cited in n. 2) suppose).

[9] So rightly J. Briscoe, *CR* 31 (1981), 49–51; T. J. Cornell, *JRS* 72 (1982), 203–6; Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 665–9. Cornell (in J. G. F. Powell and J. A. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic* (London, 2001), 43–4) notes that Cicero's omission of the decemvir's name at *rep.* 2.63 is typical of the allusiveness of his account of early Roman history in this work, and suggests that this feature is required by the dramatic setting. See also on F21 on another item claimed by Wiseman as omitted by Cicero because Antias had not yet invented it.

[10] Thus e.g. Zohren, *Valerius Antias u. Caesar* (1910), 7–22, argued that the oath not to suffer kings to reign at Rome, reportedly taken after the expulsion of the Tarquins, was invented by Antias after Caesar's assassination, and J. D. Cloud, *LCM* 2 (1977), 205–13, maintains that the account of the trial of Horatius in Livy 1.24 incorporates echoes of the trial of Rabirius in 63 which can be attributed to Antias.

Such claims lack cogency. It is in fact difficult to identify with certainty elements in the tradition which must reflect events of the 60s BC or later and must derive from a source rather than being embellishments introduced by our authorities themselves.[11] Where such elements can be identified, they may be ascribed to Tubero (38), the only annalist who certainly wrote in the mid-first century BC.

We may thus conclude that Valerius Antias wrote, as Velleius (supported by the other ancient authorities) implies, in the early first century BC. The modern conjecture that the period of writing was roughly 80–60 BC provides the best fit with what we can tell about the structure and terminal point of the history.[12] As we shall see, the work's structure poses a problem, which constitutes the most weighty argument advanced in favour of the later dating. However, the ancient support for this earlier dating is so strong that it cannot be set aside to resolve the structural issue.

It is also impossible to establish priority of composition between Antias and other historians writing in the early first century, and in particular between Antias, Quadrigarius, Macer, and Sisenna.[13] There is no reason to suppose that Velleius' mentioning Quadrigarius first (T6) implies chronological priority, and the order of names in Fronto's stylistic comparison of early historians (T9=GT6) certainly carries no chronological implications.[14]

Work: style and structure

We cannot say what title Valerius Antias gave to his work, if any. The ancient evidence on the matter tells us little: Gellius cites it four times as *Historia* or *Historiae* (F3, 13, 17, 25), but he (F15) and Priscian (F11) cite it once each as *Annales*. It is, however, clear from the fragments and from what we can discern of the use made of the work by Livy and other later writers that it followed what was by Antias' day a well-established pattern: an account of the history of the Roman people from its origins down to the writer's own time, arranged for the republican period annalistically, by the consular year. The latest datable fragment (F67) deals with an event in 91/90 BC, but, since comparatively few fragments survive from the later part of the work, there is no reason to suppose that it stopped soon after that point.

For Fronto (T9) Antias (by contrast with Quadrigarius) wrote 'without charm' (*inuenuste*), and we hear of no dissenters from this judgement. This lack of stylistic

[11] A notable instance is the tale of the conspiracy to restore the Tarquins (Livy 2.3–5; DH 5.3–13; Plut. *Publ.* 3–7). Some elements in the versions transmitted to us clearly reflect the conspiracy of Catiline, but the core of the story is probably older. Our authorities differ on the consuls and their role: according to Livy, L. Tarquinius Collatinus had been replaced by P. Valerius Publicola before the conspiracy, whereas Dionysius and Plutarch make this development a consequence of the conspiracy and represent Publicola as arresting the conspirators as a private citizen. The latter version is often ascribed to Antias (e.g. H. Tränkle, *Hermes* 93 (1965), 311–37; Wiseman, *Roman Drama*, 80–2), but the attribution is not certain, and this version may anyway pre-date the Catilinarian affair.

[12] For this dating see e.g. Ogilvie, *Comm.* 13.

[13] Macer may have drawn on Antias' account of Acca Larentia: see on F3. Forsythe ('Dating and arranging' (2002), 99–102) infers Macer's priority from F24, but see ad loc.

[14] *Contra* Peter cccv, taking Fronto's placing of Antias as corroborating Velleius' dating. Fronto's list starts with Sallust and ends with Cato and Coelius!

distinction led grammarians to take little account of his work, and as a result we have only nine verbatim fragments, all brief (F10–17, 68). Such distinctive features as they exhibit are best taken as reflecting current usage at the time of writing rather than deliberate archaism.[15]

Lack of interest among grammarians has also resulted in a low number of fragments with attested book numbers: twelve (F1, 7–9a, 10–17), plus one more where the transmitted book number must be corrupt (F58). In consequence, we are poorly informed about the economy of Antias' history. The first book extended at least to the birth of Romulus (F1). The reign of Numa was treated in the second book (F7–9a). Peter's view that the second book extended to the expulsion of the kings is mere conjecture. For the republic we have only one firm datum. The context of F13, attributed to Book 22, is clearly identifiable as the dispute at Rome in 136 following the treaty concluded with the Numantines the previous year by C. Hostilius Mancinus. Support for this identification may be drawn from the fact that F12, also attributed to book 22, refers to the recent conclusion of a treaty and may plausibly be taken as also referring to the Mancinus episode. Attempts to identify the context of other fragments with attested book numbers have all failed to carry conviction.

Antias, then, had reached 136 BC by book 22, but this was less than a third of the way through the work, for four fragments (F14–17) survive which are attributed to later books, respectively books 24, 45, 74, and 75. Although book size might vary considerably, important consequences nonetheless follow from these data for the scale and character of the work. Firstly, the history was on a much larger scale than all but one of its predecessors. Such evidence as we have suggests that most earlier histories had extended to only quite a small number of books (Cato and probably Piso took seven books, Hemina four or five). The remarkable exception was the work of Cn. Gellius, which reached 216 in book 33 (14 F9) and for which a fragment is cited from book 97 (14 F10). Antias' contemporary Quadrigarius also wrote on a larger scale than earlier writers other than Gellius, but not as amply as Antias: having started from 390, he reached the Mancinus affair by book 9 (24 F76–7), and book 23 is the highest recorded (24 F91).

Secondly, Antias treated recent history on a very much more ample scale than that of earlier times. If he stopped with the death of Sulla in 78, he will have treated the period from 136 on at just over a book per year, a density of treatment about seventeen times greater than for the period 509–136. It is not surprising that Antias should have treated recent history more fully than that of the early period. Cato and others among his predecessors had done the same, as did Quadrigarius and later Livy. It is the scale of the increase which is remarkable. By contrast, Livy treated the later period only about four times more densely than the earlier, and Quadrigarius only about seven times. Livy allotted fifty-five books to Roman history down to the Mancinus affair, over twice as many as Antias, but even he could not match Antias' density on the

[15] Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 261–2; see I. 32; *contra* Badian, 'Early historians', 22 and n. 111; see also Volkmann, *RE* 7A. 2322.

following period: he only took a further thirty-five books on developments from 136 until the death of Sulla.

The extreme disparity between Antias' treatment of earlier events and of the recent past was first identified as a problem by Münzer.[16] His solution was to reject the high book numbers in F15–17 (and in the fragments of Cn. Gellius) as either corrupt or the inventions of citing authors keen to impress by the extent of their reading. This drastic solution has rightly found no support.

It was in response to Münzer that Holzapfel first argued for the lower dating for Antias. Supposing that Antias' work continued down to the forties would certainly resolve the difficulty over his density of coverage, and this has rightly been identified by Walt as the most powerful argument in favour of the later dating.[17] However, as we have seen, the earlier dating for Antias is too well supported for re-dating to be a viable solution to the problem of the work's structure.

Forsythe has recently suggested an alternative solution, namely that F13 occurred not in Antias' narrative of the Mancinus affair but as a reference forward in his account of the parallel episode of the Caudine Forks treaty in 321.[18] This would produce a much more even book distribution across Antias' work, but unfortunately the proposed interpretation of F13 is not tenable (see below on that fragment).

If it is felt to be not credible that Antias, writing in the years *c.*80–60 BC, should have devoted twenty-two books to the period down to 136 and 53 or more to the remainder of his history, there is only one recourse remaining: to suppose that the transmitted book number in F13 is corrupt and that F12 does not refer to the Mancinus episode, but to some other treaty. But this would be a drastic solution, and it is preferable to conclude that Antias did indeed accord the recent past the detailed treatment which the transmitted book numbers imply.

Antias' work most likely did extend at least down to the death of Sulla, and may well have continued a good deal further, say to the late 60s. Antias' account of the period from the Social War on, which may have amounted to a half of the whole, was probably eclipsed by the works of Sisenna and Sallust. The predominance of recent history in his work must, however, be borne in mind when assessing its character.

Work: reception, character, and quality

As the fullest of the first-century annalistic histories, Valerius Antias' work is likely to have been widely used as a source of information. Varro may well have drawn on Antias.[19] Although Dionysius and Pliny, for example, only infrequently cite Antias by name, they probably made extensive use of his work, and the same may be true of

[16] Münzer, *Hermes* 32 (1897), 469–74; *RSA* 4 (1899), 51–60.

[17] Walt, *Macer*, 307. Oddly Cloud and Wiseman do not exploit this argument, and Wiseman (*Clio's Cosmetics*, 121) assumes that Antias took his work only down to Sulla.

[18] Forsythe, *Piso*, 209–10; id., 'Dating and arranging' (2002), 103–9.

[19] For instances where Varro agreed with Antias and may have drawn on him see on F5, 21, 22, 64.

other writers who do not name him at all, such as Valerius Maximus, Silius Italicus, and Dio.[20]

Livy cites Antias thirty-five times in the extant part of his work, far more than any other author, and two fragments preserved in sources deriving from Livy (F65–6) show that he continued to cite him in the lost books dealing with the period after 167. Livy's citations are concentrated in the later books: he cites Antias once in each of books 3 and 4, but thereafter not until book 25. Many of the citations are either overtly critical or implicitly distance Livy from Antias' claims. In several passages he censures Antias for exaggerating numbers (T1–4=F28, 36, 45, 48), or otherwise indicates his doubts about his reports of numbers (F23, 43, 54, 62). At one point he contrasts Antias' version with that of 'the histories of the majority, who are also those whom you would prefer to trust' (F60). Antias' disagreements with the majority version are also pointed out at F35 and 49; elsewhere, he is criticized for his choice of source (F55a), and there are several further hints at his unreliability (F33, 46, 57, 61, 63). At several other points, even though no criticisms are expressed or hinted at, the reference to the source has the effect of indicating that Livy is not to be bound by the statement attributed to Antias.

It used to be thought that Livy was wholly dependent for material from the annalistic tradition on Antias and the other first-century annalists, making (despite his citations of them) little or no direct use of earlier Roman historical writers, and that his practice was always to follow a single source with the occasional inclusion of variants. Much energy was expended on attempts to identify Livy's sources in individual passages, with some postulating frequent source changes and others arguing that he used the same principal source over extended portions of his work (thus Klotz maintained that Antias was his principal annalistic source in books 31–8, but he changed over to Quadrigarius in book 39 in disgust at Antias' handling of the trials of the Scipios).[21] Such approaches have now been largely abandoned, and it is now generally held both that Livy did consult the earlier Roman historians directly, particularly in the first decade, and that he will have used his Roman sources more flexibly than used to be thought, so that it is rarely possible to identify the source of individual passages which lack a source attribution.[22] A qualification about this last point may be made in respect of certain categories of material, as will be seen below.

[20] Dionysius: T5, F4. Pliny: T8; F9a, 19, 27b, 58, 67; Münzer's claim (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 233–8) that Pliny mainly used Antias indirectly through Varro is implausible (see Gen. Intr. I. 102–4), although F9a and F58 may perhaps be taken from Varro. The results of the attempts of Klotz and others to identify material drawn from Antias in writers other than Livy are conveniently summarized by Volkmann, *RE* 7A. 2333–9; such speculation is mostly futile. For Valerius Maximus see on F25; R. Helm, *RE* 8A. 106–7; W. M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (London, 1992), 126–38 (unduly sceptical). For Silius see J. Nicol, *The Historical and Geographical Sources used by Silius Italicus* (Oxford, 1936); C. M. Lucarini, *Athenaeum* 92 (2004), 103–26.

[21] For discussions of Livy's sources on these lines see e.g. Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk*; U. Kahrstedt, *Die Annalistik von Livius, B. XXXI–XLV* (Berlin, 1913); Klotz, *Hermes* 50 (1915), 481–536; *Livius und seine Vorgänger*; Walsh, *Livy*, 110–37; Ogilvie, *Comm.* 5–7 and *passim*. Leidig (*Valerius Antias* (1994)) remains in this tradition. Klotz's attribution of Livian passages to Antias is conveniently summarized by Volkmann, *RE* 7A 2328–33. A. A. Howard, *HSCPh* 17 (1906), 161–82, is an early protest against such approaches.

[22] See esp. Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 1–12 (=J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.), *Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 461–75). Luce, *Livy*, 139–84; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 13–20; S. J. Northwood, in *SLLRH* 10 (Brussels, 2000), 45–55; above, I. 84–7.

In the first decade, Antias will have been only one of a number of earlier Roman writers on whom Livy drew to fashion his account. However, in the later books his practice was rather different. By then he appears to have relied mainly on Antias and Quadrigarius for the annalistic tradition, and he composed his narrative by interweaving what he took from those sources with material drawn from Polybius and, for the Hannibalic War, Coelius Antipater. He was well aware of the superiority of Polybius' account to Antias', particularly on events in the Greek East, and it will have been this awareness in particular which prompted the critical stance he adopted towards Antias.[23] Nonetheless, in view of the ample material which Antias supplied, Livy felt obliged to make heavy use of him.

Livy's hostile testimony has provided the basis for the dominant modern view of Antias, according to which he was the supreme exponent within the annalistic tradition of the use of plausible invention to expand the record of the Roman past. This practice was already well established in the Graeco-Roman historiographical tradition, but Antias is held to have taken it further than any of his predecessors. He felt free, it is held, not just to invent plausible detail but to invent or rewrite whole episodes and did so on a probably unparalleled scale. It will, it is supposed, have been the inclusion of such invented material which enabled him to write at substantially greater length than his predecessors other than Cn. Gellius (whose high number of books is explained in the same way).[24] Moreover, he could use his inventive powers to promote his own concerns: he is commonly credited with the invention of most of the favourable tradition about the Valerii which bulks so large in our accounts of early Rome, and Wiseman has argued that he was also responsible for the hostile tradition about the Claudii.[25] For Badian he 'marks the nadir of historiography' ('Early historians', 21).

There can be no doubt that Antias did invent freely, at least at the level of detail. In part at least he, like other Roman historians, may have justified this as the proper use of imagination to reconstruct the past more fully and vividly than in the existing record. What is less clear is whether Antias invented to a significantly greater extent than other annalists and whether this was such a dominant feature of his history as has been supposed. One problem with the usual view is the structure of the work: there would have been less scope for large-scale invention in recounting the history of the recent past, to which, as we have seen, the bulk of the work was devoted.

Livy's critical faculties were particularly aroused by figures for booty and battle casualties, although his scepticism was only intermittent and he accepted without demur many such figures (no doubt often taken from Antias) which are just as outrageous as those he queried. He draws our attention to numerous suspiciously precise and/or high figures from Antias, particularly for enemy killed (figures for enemy prisoners are generally more modest). In some cases he is able to contrast these

[23] Livy praises Polybius' reliability at 30.45.5 and 33.10.10. He indicates his preference for Polybius' version over Antias' explicitly apropos of F36 and F43 and, without naming Polybius, at F61.

[24] See e.g. Badian, 'Early historians', 21; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 22; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 89–92. For rhetorical expansion and the annalistic tradition see Gelzer, *Kl. Schr.* 3. 220 ff., 272 ff.; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 21–6.; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 3–12, 72–9.

[25] The Valerii: see esp. Münzer, *De gente Valeria*; Wiseman, *Roman Drama*, 75–89. The Claudii: Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 57–139; but see n. 9.

figures with much lower figures in earlier sources (F27a, 28, 36, 43).[26] However, of the three cases where he supplies casualty figures from both Antias and Quadrigarius, one has Antias giving the higher figure, but not by a huge margin (F36), and the other two have Quadrigarius giving a much higher figure than Antias (F27a, 48).[27] A more distinctive feature of Antias' practice seems to be his fondness for precise figures for captured military standards, wagons, and horses (F36, 38, 43, 45), and, as has often been suspected, details of this kind may be a good indicator that Livy is using Antias.[28]

Antias will certainly have exercised considerable freedom to expand episodes, particularly in campaign narratives. Many of the tediously stereotyped battle accounts in Livy must bear his stamp, and he may have embellished them with what he took to be plausible details such as invented names for subordinate officers and large and precise casualty figures. He may well also have felt free to invent or rewrite whole episodes, but the point is less easy to demonstrate than is usually supposed.

Livy, it is true, notes several variant accounts of events given by Antias, and for some of these expressly states that Antias' version differed from that of all the other sources which he had consulted: notable instances are battles not mentioned by others (F33, 35) and radical distortions of the roles of King Eumenes and his brother Attalus before and during the Third Macedonian War (F60–1). These and other such cases may have been complete inventions on Antias' part, but we cannot exclude the possibility that he was drawing on a source. All these cases occur after Livy's last citations of earlier annalists such as Fabius and Piso, and so by then he may have ceased to consult them, and there are in any case other second-century annalists, such as Cassius Hemina and Cn. Gellius, whom Livy shows no signs of having consulted at all.

Other instances show just how real the possibility is that Livy's notices may exaggerate Antias' contribution. In one case we happen to know that a claim which Livy attributes to Antias was in fact present earlier in the tradition: Livy credits Antias with the view that the books found in 181 and attributed to Numa were Pythagorean (F57), but Pliny *nat.* 13.86–7 shows that this had already been asserted by Hemina (6 F35) and Piso (9 F14). L. Flamininus' expulsion from the senate constitutes a similar, if less clear-cut case: Livy complains that Antias' account of the charge against him differed from that given in Cato's speech (F55a), but other evidence shows that his version of the identity of Flamininus' victim was probably established in the earlier annalistic tradition. Similarly, Livy's report of the preliminaries of Zama has been taken to show that Antias invented initial hostilities

[26] See also Livy 22.7.1–3, accepting Fabius' casualty figures for Trasimene rather than the much higher figures of unnamed later authors.

[27] Similarly Antias gave a more accurate figure for Philip's indemnity payments than Quadrigarius (F37). On Paullus' booty Livy noted that Antias' figure was actually too low (F62, perhaps a scribal error).

[28] On Antias' casualty details see further A. Ziolkowski, *PdP* 45 (1990), 15–36; P. Erdkamp, in *SLLRH* 13 (2006), 166–82. As Erdkamp notes, Livy's reports of Antias' information include some or all of the following in the same unvarying order: enemy soldiers killed; captured enemy soldiers, standards, horses, wagons; Romans killed. R. A. Laroche offers a wholly misconceived interpretation of Antias' figures, claiming that the totals were selected for their mystical connotations and that discrepancies arose through abacus errors, at *Historia* 26 (1977), 358–68; *C&M* 35 (1984), 93–104; *Latomus* 47 (1988), 758–771.

(F34), but other evidence shows that this fabrication went back to an earlier stage of the tradition.

It is only occasionally that we can compare Antias' version with other accounts in this way. Where we lack such indications, caution is in order in identifying features as Antias' original contribution, but some novelties can be ascribed to him with reasonable confidence. He seems to have originated the rationalizing debunking of the foundation myth in which the wolf became Acca Larentia, the prostitute (*lupa*) (F2). Something of the same rationalizing spirit may have underlain his heterodox version of the story of Servius Tullius' head bursting into flames, in which the event occurred not in infancy but in adulthood (F20), but the miracle still takes place, and Antias' fanciful account of Numa's luring of divinities (F8) shows that his work was not consistently rationalizing. For some later events too Antias offered his readers an alternative to the familiar version: thus he refused to accept Scipio Africanus' chaste rejection of a female Spanish prisoner (F29), and he differed from the vulgate on the identity of Pyrrhus' would-be poisoner and implausibly involved the senate in the Roman warning to the king (F25).

The trials of the Scipios have long been held to provide the clearest evidence of just how far Antias was prepared to go in rhetorical invention. Livy followed Antias as his main source and thus provides us with detailed evidence for his account, corroborated by Gellius, while at the same time we have extensive information about other versions, particularly in Polybius, Gellius, and Livy's own discussion of variants. The classic discussions of Mommsen and Fraccaro assume that the true course of events can be reconstructed from these sources and that Antias can be shown to have departed radically from the earlier tradition for rhetorical effect. However, it is by no means as easy to reconstruct the pre-Antias tradition as these scholars supposed, and, while Antias' version will have involved both reshaping and outright invention, he may have been seeking not just to impress and entertain, but also to make sense out of discordant and incoherent materials.[29]

Antias will have played his part in the refashioning of the record to the greater glory of the Roman people which is so marked in, for example, Livy's accounts of the origins of wars, but whether his inventions served any more specific purpose remains a matter for conjecture. He may well have used his powers of invention to enhance the prominence of the Valerii and to elaborate their role as champions of the people, but this remains an unconfirmed assumption, and the core elements of this tradition were probably established well before Antias wrote.[30] What his political views were and how far they coloured his presentation of events, we have no means of telling.[31]

Whatever the extent of his inventions, they represented only one side of Valerius Antias' contribution to the Roman historical tradition. Another, which has not been sufficiently recognized, was archival research.

[29] See further on F49–52. For the traditional view of Antias' aims as a rhetorical historian see esp. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* 1, 413: 'questa storiografia retorica non solo considerava lecito atteggiare, disporre, arricchire con invenzioni d'ogni genere la materia storica, ma riteneva questo il sommo dell'arte.'

[30] So rightly Cornell, 'Formation', 77–8; Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 91. See further on F21–2.

[31] There is, for example, no solid evidence for the view of Ogilvie (*Comm.* 15–16) that Antias was a partisan of Sulla.

Livy was dependent on his annalistic sources not only for much of his war narratives but for almost all of his domestic material. For the middle republic, much of the domestic material consisted of routine notices on such matters as provinces, armies, prodigies, priesthoods, and the like, material which (despite some distortions) must go back ultimately to archival sources, and in particular the records of the senate's decrees. The availability of such material also shapes the structure of the narrative. For the middle republic (but not for the earlier period) Livy took over from one or more sources a standard chronological and structural framework for his year-narratives, which in its basic form starts with a domestic section recounting the consuls' entry into office and early activity in Rome, then moves to external affairs with the consuls' departure for their provinces and activity there, and then returns to domestic affairs for the end of the year. This standard framework was based on the documentary research which supplied the routine domestic detail, but the archives cannot themselves have supplied the pattern. The pattern must have been established by an annalist who not only undertook a good deal of archival research, but also imposed thematic and chronological order.

The most likely candidate to have carried out this work is Valerius Antias. Livy must have found the standard framework for the year and the routine domestic detail in his work.[32] It is usually supposed that he found it also in Quadrigarius' history, but what we are told about this work, for example its comparatively small scale and attractive style, suggests the contrary, and the one fragment which deals with a consul's entry into office is conspicuously lacking in the routine detail familiar from the Livian accounts (24 F57). Antias' history must therefore have been Livy's only source for the standard framework and for most of the routine domestic detail. Among Antias' predecessors, only Cn. Gellius wrote on a large enough scale to incorporate such material. Antias could have taken it over from him, but on balance it seems more likely that he himself both undertook the archival research and shaped the results into the annual pattern with which we are familiar from Livy's mid-republican narratives.[33]

As with his other materials, Antias will have felt free both to reshape the results of this archival research and to supplement it, where he felt it appropriate, with what he regarded as plausible inventions. An instance of this process at work can be seen in his information about an army commanded by A. Cornelius Mammula in Greece in 190: we know from Livy's Polybian account that no such army was stationed in Greece.[34]

Livy's decision to make extensive use of Antias despite his low opinion of his work is thus less paradoxical than it at first sight appears. Antias' history was replete with inventions and exaggerations, both his own and his predecessors'. However, apart from Cn. Gellius' work (which Livy may never have consulted), it was the most ample available account of Roman history, and also for the middle republic uniquely

[32] For domestic material of this kind in the extant fragments see F11, 14, 58, 63, 64.

[33] For this view both of the structuring of the annual narratives and of Antias' contribution see Rich, 'Structuring Roman history'. For the view that Antias himself drew heavily on the archives and in particular on recorded *senatus consulta* see also Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, esp. 24 ff.

[34] See on F46.

provided a wealth of detail deriving from archival sources and an annual framework based on that material.

Antias, then, like some of his predecessors, had a two-pronged strategy for expanding the Roman past: invention and research. On the early centuries he will have relied mainly on his powers of invention, elaborating his predecessors' work with stereotyped set-pieces and spurious precision. On the middle republic he continued to make much use of those techniques, but he also deployed his extensive research in the archives to provide both a new wealth of domestic detail and a formal structure for his annual narratives. Regrettably, we have virtually no knowledge of how Antias handled the recent past, to which he devoted the bulk of his history.[35]

The testimonia are arranged in chronological order of citing authorities. Since so few of the fragments can be assigned to books, an arrangement of the fragments in a single chronological sequence (as by Peter, followed by Chassignet and Beck–Walter) obscures what is known of the book structure of Antias' history. We have therefore arranged the fragments in the following sequences: (1) fragments which can be assigned to books (F1–17) (2) fragments not assignable to books, in chronological order of the events referred to (F18–68) (3) doubtful fragments (F69–71). F58 has been included in the second sequence since the attributed book number must be corrupt.

(JWR)

[35] For a more detailed version of the foregoing discussion see Rich, *BICS* 48 (2005), 137–61.

26

L. Cornelius Sisenna

Editions: Peter 1^2. cccxxxiv–cccxlix, 276–97; G. Barabino, *Studi Noniani* 1 (1967), 69–251; Chassignet 3. xxxviii–xlix, 50–88, 193–221; Beck–Walter 2. 241–313; C. Sensal, *Les Trois premiers livres des Historiae de L. Cornelius Sisenna*: traduction et commentaire (Diss. Laval, 1997) (available through UMI microfilms at www.proquest.com; cf. *APh* 1997, 68–04364).[1]

Principal discussions (including works on the Social War): C. L. Roth, *L. Cornelii Sisennae uita* (Basle, 1834); A. Kiene, *Der römische Bundesgenossenkrieg* (Leipzig, 1845); A. Riese, 'Über das Geschichtswerk des L. Cornelius Sisenna', *Festschrift des historisch-philosophischen Vereins zu Heidelberg zur Begrüssung der 24. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner* (Leipzig, 1865), 51–64 (*non uidimus*); A. Schneider, *De L. Cornelii Sisennae reliquiis* (Jena, 1882; *non uidimus*); C. Cali, *La vita e le opere di L. Cornelio Sisenna* (Catania, 1894) (=*Studi letterari*, Turin, 1898, 93 ff.) (*non uidimus*; bibliographical details from Schanz–Hosius); E. Marcks, *Die Überlieferung des Bundesgenossenkriegs 91–89 v.Chr.* (Marburg, 1884); B. Niese, 'L. Cornelius (374) Sisenna', *RE* 4 (1900), 1512–13; W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford, 1901); W. M. Lindsay, 'De fragmentis scriptorum apud Nonium seruatis', *RhM* 57 (1902), 196–204; A. von Domaszewski, 'Bellum Marsicum', *SB.HAW* 201.1 (1924); Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 324–8; J. Carcopino, *La République romaine de 133 à 44 avant J.C.* (Paris, 1935), 349–88; I. Haug, 'Der römische Bundesgenossenkrieg 91–88 v. Chr. bei Titus Livius', *WJA* 2 (1947), 100–39, 201–58 (esp. 215–17); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 251–8; E. Badian, 'Waiting for Sulla', *JRS* 52 (1962), 47–61 (=*Studies* (1964), 206–34); E. Candiloro, 'Sulle *historiae* di L. Cornelius Sisenna', *SCO* 12 (1963), 212–26; E. Badian, 'Where was Sisenna?', *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 422–31; E. S. Gruen, 'The *Lex Varia*', *JRS* 55 (1965), 59–73; G. Barabino, 'Sisenna e gli avverbi in *-im*', *Tetraonyma* (Genoa, 1966), 33–59; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 25–6, 37–8; E. Gabba, *Appiani bellorum ciuilium liber primus* (2nd edn., Florence 1967); E. Badian, '*Quaestiones Variae*', *Historia* 18 (1969), 447–91; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 267–86; P. Frassinetti, 'Sisenna e la guerra sociale', *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 78–113; G. Calboli, 'Su alcuni frammenti di Cornelio Sisenna', *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 1, 151–221; E. Paratore, 'La leggenda di Enea nei frammenti di Sisenna', ibid. 223–44; E. Rawson, 'L. Cornelius Sisenna and the Early First Century B.C.', *CQ* 29 (1979), 327–46 (=*Roman Culture* (1990), 363–88); E. Gabba, *CAH*^{2} 9 (1994), 104–28; H. Mouritsen, *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (London, 1998); M. Pobjoy, 'The first *Italia*', in E. Herring, K. Lomas (eds.), *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium* BC (London, 2000), 187–211; C. Sensal, 'La Transmission des fragments des *Historiae* de L. Cornelius Sisenna', in F. Bertini (ed.), *Prolegomena Noniana* 2, (Genoa, 2003), 109–29; Kierdorf, *RGS* (2003), 67–70; A. Perutelli, *Prolegomeni a Sisenna* (Pisa, 2004); M. Ambrosetti, 'Sulla lingua di L. Cornelio Sisenna', *InvLuc* 31 (2009), 9–58.

[1] Sensal's views on individual fragments are reported by Chassignet, and her fragment numbers by both Chassignet and Beck–Walter.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Since L. Cornelius Sisenna (the *gentilicium* is attested only in T1 and, if the fragment is indeed of Sisenna, F127) was praetor in 78 BC (T1), he cannot, under the provisions of the *lex Villia annalis*, have been born later than 118, though he may, of course, have held his praetorship at more than the minimum age. But Velleius Paterculus (T13) can scarcely be right to say that Sisenna was a young man at the time of the Numantine War.[2]

It has usually been assumed that Sisenna was a member of the patrician *gens* of the Cornelii. Rawson,[3] however, may have been right to hold that the *cognomen* indicates Etruscan origin, the *gentilicium* having been taken on enfranchisement. However that may be, the first Cornelius Sisenna in the historical record is the praetor of 183 (Livy 39.45.2). In the generation before the historian we have a praetor in ?119 and a *monetalis*.[4]

One would expect Sisenna to have served in the Social War, and Badian[5] has suggested that he did so under Sulla. That is far from certain, but Badian[6] is probably right in his belief that Sisenna remained in Rome during the years 86–84—he was a younger rival of P. Antistius, the leading orator of the 80s (cf. T7), though it cannot be excluded that he joined Sulla in the East after that.[7] As praetor in 78, he held both the urban and peregrine jurisdictions (T1); according to Cicero (T5), who describes him as 'too free in making a present of his legal decisions', he failed to follow his own edict when he refused to grant possession of the property of one Cn. Cornelius to P. Cornelius Scipio.[8] T2 may be an indication that he served as governor of Sicily after his praetorship, and T4 shows that he had a number of links with the island. In 70 Sisenna was one of the defenders of Verres (T2, 4). In the war against the pirates he served as a *legatus* under Pompey, who put him in charge of the eastern seaboard of Greece and Macedonia (T21). He intervened unsuccessfully with Metellus Creticus on behalf of the Cretan cities who had come to an agreement with Pompey; soon afterwards he fell ill and died (T22).

Sisenna was a notable orator, though in Cicero's judgement he failed to reach the height of the profession (T6–7). Cicero refers to his fondness for unusual words, and quotes an extraordinary neologism he used in the defence of C. Hirtilius (if the name

[2] Frassinetti's attempt (*Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 79–80) to take *tum . . . erat iuuenis* with *celebre et Lucili nomen fuit*, producing a date around the time of Lucilius' death at the end of the second century, is unconvincing (Peter (cccxxxvi) similarly thought that Velleius was talking about the time when Marius and Jugurtha were on opposite sides). Perutelli (*Prolegomeni* (2004), 9) thinks that Cic. *Brut.* 228 places his birth half way between those of P. Sulpicius Rufus in 124 and Hortensius in 114 (though he inverts the two dates). But Cicero is talking of the periods in which the three men were active as orators, and may merely have assumed that Sisenna was younger than Sulpicius.

[3] *Roman Culture*, 364–5. [4] Cf. *MRR* 3. 73.

[5] *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 430; cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 371–2.

[6] *Studies*, 214; id., *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 422–31; *contra* Candiloro, *SCO* 12 (1963), 214–15; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *JRS* 55 (1965), 231–2.

[7] Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 374. [8] See A. W. Lintott, *CQ* 27 (1977), 184–6.

is correctly transmitted[9]) (T8). His innovations were often based on analogy (cf. T10). Sisenna's friendship with Lucullus and Hortensius (T16), Atticus (T8), and, despite political differences, Licinius Macer (T6), is attested. It is possible that he espoused the Epicurean philosophy (T9).[10]

Works

There can be no doubt that Sisenna called his work *Historiae*—that is the title it is given in almost all the citations by Nonius, as well as by Gellius and Priscian.[11] Just once (F3) the title is given as *Ab urbe condita*;[12] attempts to remove the problem by emendation (see apparatus to F3) are misguided. Some[13] have combined this with an interpretation of T13 and T16 to argue that as a young man Sisenna wrote a work entitled *Ab urbe condita*, from which come the four fragments (F1–3, 140) supposedly dealing with the early history of Rome. This view, based as it is on erroneous interpretations of T13 and T16, is clearly mistaken. Velleius' *historiarum auctor iam tum Sisenna erat iuuenis* (T13) means 'the historian Sisenna was already then a young man', not 'Sisenna was already then, as a young man, a historian';[14] and the description of Sisenna in T16 as *τὸν ἱστορικόν* merely serves to identify Sisenna as the historian, and does not mean that he was a historian at the time of the episode Plutarch is narrating. We must assume, therefore, either that Sisenna's work contained a brief *archaeologia*,[15] whether as an introduction proper or as an excursus like that of Sallust in the *Catiline* (6–13), and then moved immediately to the Social and Civil Wars, or that the first book contained a summary account of Roman history from the beginning down to the time when the main narrative began later in the book (see further below). As for Nonius' citation, it seems that he was not, as in the citations from books 3 and 4, drawing directly on lists based on the text (see I. 93), but was using an alphabetical list of adverbs which misquoted the title.[16]

Some[17] have taken T16 to mean that Lucullus, Hortensius, and Sisenna all participated in a kind of lottery ('bet', often used, is not really the right word), agreeing that each would undertake a work on the Social War, with the lot determining whether it should be in one of Greek prose, Greek verse, Latin prose, or Latin verse. On this interpretation Lucullus would have drawn Greek prose, Hortensius Latin verse, and Sisenna Latin prose.[18] But this goes well beyond the evidence. Plutarch

[9] Cf. Candiloro, *SCO* 12 (1963), 214; Badian, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 425 n. 6.

[10] Cf. comm. on F3 and 79, *Prolegomeni* (2004), 9–11. As JWR observes, it may be that T9 should be taken humorously.

[11] Barabino 76.

[12] Badian (*Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 425 n. 6) strangely believed that *Ab urbe condita* was the title of the whole work.

[13] Most recently Perutelli, *Prolegomeni* (2004), 13–15; cf. Frassinetti, *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 79–81. The issue is discussed in detail, but somewhat confusingly and without any firm conclusion, by Paratore, *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 227–39.

[14] Cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 368.

[15] Thus Badian, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 425 n. 6. We therefore attribute F1–3 to book 1.

[16] See Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary* (1901), 9, 48; Barabino 73.

[17] Thus Badian, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 429–30, but without reference to his predecessors.

[18] First in this form Schanz, *GRL*, 210; cf. Münzer, *Hermes* 49 (1914), 199–201. Wölfflin, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 653–4, had thought that Hortensius and Sisenna both drew Latin prose.

talks only of an undertaking by Lucullus, not by Hortensius and Sisenna as well, while, as Rawson[19] observed, Velleius' citation of Hortensius' *Annales* (2.16.3) does not read like a reference to a poem.

There is, then, no reason to think that Sisenna had committed himself to writing the history of the Social War while still serving in it (we may allow plausibility to Badian's suggestion that the episode occurred when the three young men were serving together), and later went on to deal with the Civil War as well.[20] One cannot say for certain that he did not begin his work in the 80s, but a more economical conclusion is that the whole of it was completed in the 70s.

The earliest datable fragments of Sisenna (F4, 6, 7) refer to 91 BC, and it is likely that he began his detailed account with that year. Not only was it the year in which the Social War began, but it may also have been the stopping-point of Sempronius Asellio.[21] Similarly, although the last datable fragment of Sisenna (F135) refers to the election of Sulla as dictator in 82, it is plausible to think that he continued his work until the death of Sulla early in 78, so that as Sisenna continued Asellio, so Sallust continued Sisenna.[22]

There may be another link between Sisenna and Asellio. The latter made a distinction between those who *annales relinquere uoluissent* and those who tried *res gestas a Romanis perscribere*, the second being equivalent to *historias scribere*.[23] By calling his work *historiae* Sisenna would appear to have placed himself in the latter category. That point was made by Rawson;[24] but she goes too far in saying 'Sisenna ought not to be called an annalist', and citing F130, which she takes to mean that 'he grouped events carefully, at least inside a single year, on geographical principles'. What Sisenna is saying there is that he will deal with events (doubtless the actions of Mithridates) in Greece and Asia together, and not, like Polybius, have separate sections treating the two areas or follow a strictly chronological scheme for the whole year.[25] We may concede that Sisenna chose to group some events together within the narrative of a single year, but there can be no doubt that the account was broadly chronological, that he clearly marked the beginning and end of each year, and consequently that he was writing year-by-year 'annalistic' history.

Sallust, in a famous passage (T11), justifies his decision to say something in the *Jugurtha* about the character of Sulla by claiming that Sisenna had written with insufficient freedom of expression.[26] The implication is that Sisenna, while not totally eulogistic, did not feel free to be sufficiently critical of Sulla. The part of Sisenna's work dealing with the Civil War and its aftermath, at least, will have been written during the 70s (see above). Sulla died in 78, but his legacy meant that few were willing to criticize his actions openly. Many realised that his constitutional changes, aimed at

[19] *Roman Culture*, 368.

[20] It is unclear whether Velleius' *ciuilis Sullamque* (T13) reflects a 'punto di vista italico', which saw the Social War as a civil war (cf. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 366), or is merely an instance of careless writing by Velleius. We may note that Livy (8.8.2) stressed the similarity of the Latin War of 340–338 to a civil war.

[21] See introduction to Asellio (20), I. 276.

[22] See Badian, *Studies*, 213–14; *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 402; Syme, *Sallust*, 182; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 373.

[23] Asellio 20 F1–2. [24] *Roman Culture*, 373.

[25] Cf. Calboli, *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 151, 156.

[26] For possible criticism of Sisenna in Sallust's *Historiae* see Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 375–6.

preventing any further *popularis* agitation, were too reactionary, and the key features of the 'Sullan constitution' were eventually removed—the restriction on tribunes holding further office was repealed in 75, and in 70 the powers of the tribunes to legislate was restored and total control of the courts removed from the senate. But many members of the senate were either former supporters of Sulla or, at least, had not openly supported the Marians in the 80s. Nobody was sure what other people thought, and, above all, nobody wanted to provoke another civil conflict.

Sisenna's own position was clearly pro-optimate. A close friend of Lucullus and Hortensius and a defender of Verres could hardly be anything else. In F135 he claims that the election of Sulla as dictator commanded popular support, and F5, 29, 46, and 72 may also provide evidence of his position.[27] But he was clearly no bigot: he could be friends with a *popularis* fellow historian (T6), and take the side of Pompey against Metellus Creticus. It would be most surprising if Livy did not use him for his account of the 80s, and Badian[28] has made a good case for thinking that Sisenna was the source of that part of Livy's narrative—as far as it can be reconstructed from the *periochae*—which reflects the views of those who, though they eventually supported Sulla, stayed in Rome during the 80s.

After the fragments of the *Historiae* Peter printed the nine citations by Charisius from book 13 of the *Milesiae* of Sisenna. It has usually been assumed that the latter is identical with the historian, primarily because of a couplet of Ovid's *Tristia* (T12), which is naturally taken to mean that Sisenna translated Aristides, and that it did him no harm to have inserted indecent jokes[29] into his history. There follows the couplet:

> nec minus Hortensi nec sunt minus improba Serui
> carmina; quis dubitet nomina tanta sequi?

This has been taken to refer to the orator Hortensius (cos. 69) and the lawyer Servius Sulpicius Rufus (cos. 51) respectively. Rawson[30] claims that if the identification with the historian, the orator and the lawyer were correct, the four lines would break the chronological sequence which begins with Ennius at line 423. Hence she places all three men in the triumviral period, and identifies Hortensius with the reprobate son of the orator,[31] and Servius with the son of the lawyer.[32] Pliny (*epist.* 5.3.5) includes the famous Hortensius and Sulpicius in his list of distinguished men who wrote poetry, but, claims Rawson, was misled by *nomina tanta*: Ovid was talking about all the poets he had mentioned. She suggests that *historiae* means the narrative of the *Milesiae*.[33]

This will not do. Bawdy jokes were a standard part of Milesian tales, and one could not talk of a translator inserting them;[34] and while it is certainly true that *historia* can refer to non-historical prose works, with Sisenna as subject it is hard to think that it

[27] See comm. ad locc.

[28] *Studies*, 208–14; *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 427–8 (in reply to Candiloro, *SCO* 12 (1963), 225–6).

[29] The late David Bain suggested altering *iocos* to *locos*.

[30] *Roman Culture*, 369–71; *contra* cf. Perutelli, *Prolegomeni* (2004), 51–4.

[31] Mentioned at Cic. *Att.* 6.3.9 and Val. Max. 5.9.2.

[32] The lawyer's daughter was the Sulpicia whose poems form part of the *corpus Tibullianum*.

[33] Similarly G. Luck, *P. Ouidius Naso Tristia* 2 (Heidelberg, 1977), 145, but he translates (1 (Heidelberg, 1967), 95) 'dass er seinem Geschichtswerk niedrige Späße einfügte'. The first scholar to have proposed this view, as far as we know, was K. Bürger, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 354.

[34] Cf. E. Rohde, *RhM* 48 (1893), 130 (=*Kleine Schriften*, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901, 30).

does so here. Moreover, the reputation of the younger Hortensius was so bad that one could not possibly hold up the fact that he wrote love-poetry as an example to be followed.[35] Nor is it plausible to think that Ovid was talking about a separate work, whether original novels[36] or love poems;[37] *inserere* with the dative of a noun denoting a work of literature can refer to nothing other than the addition of material to the work.[38] As to Pliny, it is far from clear that his statement was based only on Ovid; he lists several men not mentioned by the latter, and, as Sherwin-White[39] suggests, may have derived his information from his uncle. The chronological displacement will have to be accepted, and the traditional identifications maintained. Nevertheless, fragments of *Milesiae* have no place in a collection of fragments of lost historians, and we have therefore excluded them. Moreover there is no evidence of *turpes ioci* in the fragments of the *Histories*; the only reference to sex is in F32.

The Sisenna who wrote commentaries on Plautus (Peter included the fragments in 1870, but excluded them in 1914) is post-Augustan; for in fr. 9 (Charis. 285.24–6) the reference to Virgil is clearly part of the citation, not a comment by Charisius.[40]

Arrangement of the fragments

Of the 145 fragments (143 if F144–5 are excluded as spurious), 119 are attested as coming from books 3 and 4, and all but one of these are cited by Nonius.[41] Reconstructing the original order of the fragments within these books is a complex matter. Previous editors have attempted to establish which historical events the fragments describe by comparing them with our other sources for the Social War, in particular Appian, *b.c.* 1.37.165–52.229, and have then arranged them in chronological order of the events supposedly referred to. But this is a hazardous procedure, as the context can hardly ever be established with absolute certainty; with such short fragments, cited for linguistic reasons, the results are bound to be conjectural in the majority of cases. As Barabino,[42] whose own attributions are often very speculative,[43] remarks, there were many bitter battles and harsh sieges in the Social War. For this reason, and in accordance with our generally agnostic approach, we have decided to print the fragments of each book in the order in which they appear in Nonius, and to confine speculation and discussion of the historical context to the commentary.

[35] BMI. observes that *nomina tanta* is an unfortunate phrase if it does not refer to the orator and the lawyer.

[36] Rohde, l.c. (n. 34).

[37] R. Reitzenstein, *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche* (Leipzig, 1912), 64; J. André, *Ovide, Tristes* (Paris, 1968), 166.

[38] Cf. *TLL* 7.1.1873.10 ff.

[39] Comm. on Pliny *epist.* 5.3.5.

[40] *Contra* cf. Perutelli, *Prolegomeni* (2004), 55–62, 92–4, assigning F136 and 139, and perhaps F5 and 8 (pp. 92–4), to the work.

[41] It seems that Nonius had either a text of only books 3–4 (or for some reason chose to use only those books) or a list of passages derived from those books. On the texts used by Nonius see Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary* (1901), 7–10. See further I. 93, 307.

[42] 171 n. 416; cf. Frassinetti, *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 106.

[43] The amount of disagreement with her views expressed in the commentary should not obscure the very real merits of her contribution to the study of Sisenna.

Taken as a whole, the arrangement of the fragments of each book in the order in which they appear in Nonius does not reflect the order in which they all appeared in Sisenna's original text. Certain groups of fragments, however, can be assumed to have appeared in Sisenna in the same order as they are cited by Nonius, if they come within the scope of the so-called Lindsay's Law.[44] Lindsay showed that when Nonius cited, as his main or 'primary' illustration of a given lemma, passages from authors still extant, his quotations, within an individual book or individual section of the alphabetized books (2–4),[45] follow the order of the original text. The same is true of a main quotation followed by a 'secondary' or added quotation, or of two added quotations. It is reasonable to assume that the law also applies to fragmentary texts; it does not, however, apply to a secondary quotation and the next primary quotation, nor to two or more secondary quotations illustrating different lemmata, nor to two or more primary quotations in different books or different sections of the alphabetized books; nor can the law tell us anything about the length of the interval between two quotations in the original text. And we cannot exclude the possibility that in an individual case Nonius has departed from his normal practice or that dislocation has occurred in the course of transmission.

We thus have an important, if limited, criterion for the ordering of many of the fragments of Sisenna. The following groups of fragments are governed by Lindsay's Law and can therefore be assumed to have been taken from Sisenna's text in the order in which they appear in Nonius (and are listed here). From book 3: F10–12; 16–17; 20–1; 23–5; 26–8; 38–9; 42–4; 54–5; and from book 4: F58–60; 61–2; 64–8; 71–3; 74–5; 85–6; 88–9; 112–14; 124–6.[46] By 1914 Peter (cccxlvi–cccxlviii) was aware of Lindsay's Law, but because of its limitations chose to ignore it, retaining the enumeration of his first edition.[47] Barabino, however, applied the law, combining it with arguments derived from comparing the fragments with other sources. And since, as the law requires, citations from book 3 regularly precede those from book 4, in one case (F26) she was able to determine the book number when the manuscripts differed.[48]

An inevitable consequence of our procedure is that groups of fragments which, certainly or probably, deal with the same matter (e.g. 10, 35, 47, 48 on naval matters; 20, 21, 31, 33 and 66, 120, 121 on trials under the *lex Varia*; 99 and 119 on the *uer sacrum*) appear in different places, as indeed they may have done in Sisenna's narrative. On the other hand, our arrangement, by definition, never involves a breach of Lindsay's Law.

[44] See Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary* (1901). Lindsay's position is defended, with certain modifications, by D. C. White, *Studi Noniani* 8 (1980), 111–211. As Perutelli (*Prolegomeni* (2004), 76–7) points out, the elements of Lindsay's case were in fact known in Germany some forty years earlier, and in 1882 Schneider produced an ordering of the fragments markedly different from that of Peter. See also I. 93–4.

[45] The alphabetization is by initial letter only. It is disputed whether it was done by Nonius himself or a later editor.

[46] The groups of fragments that are governed by Lindsay's Law are indicated in the commentary as and when they occur.

[47] For speculation on Peter's underlying motives see Perutelli, *Prolegomeni* (2004), 78, 86.

[48] White strangely (particularly for an article in *Studi Noniani*) says (art. cit. (n. 44), 199) that 'little in Peter . . . would need to be changed on Nonius' evidence'.

Scope and content of the individual books

The reconstruction of the scope and content of the first five books is much disputed. The various opinions of earlier scholars are conveniently set out by Frassinetti (*Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 82–4), who then offers a version of his own (84–6). But all such reconstructions are highly conjectural, and the evidence we have does not allow us to choose between them, nor does it justify any new attempt.[49] Nevertheless it is important to define the limits of our knowledge.

Only four fragments (F4, F5, F7, F8) can be certainly assigned to books 1 and 2. Of these, only two (F4, F7) can be given any kind of context. F4, from book 1, probably refers to the increasing tension in Italy in the months leading up to the Social War. Certainly the flight of people to Aesernia, and then on the next day to Rome, cannot have occurred during the siege of the city, which started at the very beginning of hostilities in 91 (cf. comm. on F4). F7, from book 2, has the Marsi engaged in fighting, and must therefore belong to a time after the Social War had broken out.

From this limited information we can deduce no more than that book 1 dealt (among other things) with events leading to the Social War, and that book 2 included at least some events of the war itself. Beyond that it is difficult to say anything for certain. For instance it is quite unclear whether the actual start of the war (in the last months of 91 BC) was narrated in book 1 or book 2. For this reason we have printed F6, which refers to the prodigies that occurred just before or just after the outbreak of hostilities, under the heading 'book 1 or 2'. The same uncertainty surrounds the location of other events of 91: the political conflicts at Rome leading to the death of the tribune M. Livius Drusus, the massacre at Asculum and the preparations of the Italian insurgents, and their organization of an alternative state based at Corfinium—these momentous events must have been dealt with somehow by Sisenna, but no trace of his account of them can be clearly identified among the surviving fragments.[50] All we can say is that they must have been narrated in the first two books, and that book 2 included the first bouts of fighting at the start of the war.

Three fragments (1–3), cited without book number but dealing with the legendary origins of Rome, are normally placed in book 1, except by those who regard them as belonging to a different work altogether (see I. 307). In our view they certainly come from the *Histories*, and we too have placed them at the start of book 1, where as we have seen they are likely to have formed part of an introductory survey of early Roman history. Most earlier commentators have assumed that this survey was a brief excursus dealing only with the mythical origins of the city, and that it was followed immediately by the main narrative beginning with the events of 91 and the build-up to the Social War. But this is a very hazardous inference to draw from the purely fortuitous survival of the four fragments attributable to book 1 that can be given a definite context—three of which deal with Aeneas, and the other with the preliminaries of the Social War.

[49] More recent editors and commentators have rightly been more circumspect, either leaving the questions open (Sensal (18–19), Chassignet (xlv–xlviii)), or leaving them entirely aside (Beck–Walter 2. 243–4).

[50] On the possibility that F5 has some connection with the legislation of Drusus, and that F141 refers to events at Asculum, see comm. ad locc.

In fact it is perfectly possible that Sisenna's historical introduction extended beyond the remote legendary origins of the city. For all we know it may have occupied most of the first book, and included a comprehensive summary of Roman history from the foundation to the Social War (this would at least explain Nonius' characterization of the book as *ab urbe condita*: F3). Alternatively it could have concentrated on selected aspects or themes of that history—for instance the Roman conquest of Italy, the growth of the Italian alliance, and the tensions that led to the Social War, or an account of earlier political struggles, from the Conflict of the Orders down to the time of the Gracchi, Marius, and Saturninus. In the almost complete absence of evidence, any such speculation is possible and nothing can be ruled out (see further comm. on F5).

Turning to book 2, we can say no more than that some events of the Social War were included in it (F7). As we have seen, its starting-point is purely a matter for conjecture. There has also been much debate about where it ended, and where book 3 began. Some have argued that it covered the last part of 91 BC and included some of 90, the rest of which would have been dealt with in book 3.[51] Others have suggested that the end of book 2 coincided with the end of the consular year 91, and that book 3 began with the start of 90.[52] Frassinetti, on the other hand, maintains that book 2 ended in the autumn of 91 (he suggests that it concluded with the death of Drusus), and that the last weeks of that year, together with the first part of 90, were dealt with in book 3.[53] The latter view is based on the belief that F26 refers to the enactment of the *lex Varia*; Frassinetti (and Barabino, but she did not see the consequences) thought that it was promulgated at the first possible opportunity (the tribunes entered office on 10 December).[54] Even if he were right, it could not have been passed until the beginning of January,[55] though it is possible that Sisenna dealt with its promulgation and passage together. But Sisenna need not have referred to its promulgation at all, and if he dealt only with its passage he would have done so when narrating the events of the early part of 90. It is most probable (though it cannot be certain) that Sisenna ended book 2 with the end of the consular year 91, and began book 3 with the entry into office of the consuls of 90, perhaps going straight on to the passing of the *lex Varia*.

One obvious possibility is that in the first part of his work Sisenna devoted one book to each year. After an introductory survey *ab urbe condita* in book 1, he would have narrated the beginnings of the Social War in book 2, down to the end of 91. Book 3 would have contained the events of 90, and book 4 those of 89. This reconstruction, which is essentially similar to that of Schneider, has the virtue of neatness, is consistent with the evidence, and may even be right. But it is important to repeat that the evidence is insufficient to prove any theory, even when we are dealing with books 3 and 4, from which the great majority of the fragments are taken.

As explained above, we have made no attempt to arrange the fragments in chronological order of the events they supposedly refer to.[56] More generally it can be said

[51] Thus e.g. Peter cccxl; Barabino 86. [52] Cf. Frassinetti, *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 83.
[53] Ibid. 84–6. [54] Barabino 86; Frassinetti, *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 88.
[55] Cf. Gruen, *JRS* 55 (1965), 59; Badian, *Historia* 18 (1969), 459.
[56] The suggestions of previous editors and commentators are outlined and discussed in the commentary.

that the fragments of book 3 that can be given a more or less probable context can all be assigned to the year 90, and those of book 4 to 89.

The fragments of book 3 include probable references to the passage of the *lex Varia* (F15, 26, 29, and possibly 37) and to some of the consequent trials (F20, 21, 31, 33); there are likely references to the battle of the Tolenus on 11 June (F11, and perhaps F23 and F27), to the death of Caepio (F46), to the siege of Aesernia (F12 and also a reference to the consumption of the year's harvest, which must date it to late summer or autumn: F13), and to the victory of the consul L. Caesar at Acerrae (F49, and possibly F55). F38, referring to the creation of two new voting tribes, must have come after an account of the main enfranchisement law, the *lex Iulia*, passed in the last months of 90; and finally F36, referring to the mutiny of the army of L. Porcius Cato, must also belong at the end of the year.[57] The first part of F9 deals with an event of 90, and we have therefore placed it in book 3, even though it has no book number. It is the only fragment of book 3 not cited by Nonius, and our reason for placing it first is that it comes from an earlier source (Cicero), not that it belongs to the early part of the year;[58] in fact it could belong anywhere in Sisenna's account of the consular year 90 BC.

Book 4 has more preserved fragments than any other book, all but one from Nonius,[59] but hardly any of them can be placed securely in a precise historical context. This remains true even in the case of fragments that contain proper names—of persons, peoples, or places.[60] Many can be linked to a general context of pitched battles or military manoeuvres, sieges and the capture of towns, naval and maritime affairs, political events, diplomacy, grants of citizenship, speeches, and religion.[61] But identification of the precise event or episode is far more difficult, and virtually impossible to achieve in all but a tiny minority of cases.

Fragments that can with some degree of probability be linked with events known from other sources include F65 and 72 (the *lex Plautia*),[62] F58, 80, 85, and 123 (Sulla's operations against Cluentius in Campania),[63] and F88–9 (the siege and capture of Herculaneum).[64] F125 probably refers to an event in the East involving the forces of Mithridates (see comm. ad loc.). Other fragments that can be given a reasonably

[57] For all these, see the commentary on the relevant fragments.

[58] As Peter and Barabino seem to have assumed, since they place the fragment in book 2, which on their view (cf. n. 51) included the early part of 90.

[59] The exception is F127 from Festus; on F115b, from Gellius, see comm. ad loc.

[60] Thus: F59 (Gaius Titinius), F96 (Papius), F105 (Poppaedius), F111 (Pomponius), F78 (Tudertes), F80, 123 (Gauls), F119 (Sabines), F62 (Iguvium), F84 (Iguvium, Perusia), F89 (Herculaneum), F115a (Nuceria).

[61] Battles and manoeuvres: F56, 60, 70, 73, 80, 83, 85, 86, 87, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 105, 107, 108, 109, 112, 115, 117, 122, 123; sieges: F68, 69, 75, 77, 88, 89, 93, 94, 95, 97, 101, 102, 109, 111, 124, 125, 126; maritime affairs: F66, 113, 120, 121; political events: F57, 65, 72, 76, 81, 92, 104; diplomacy: F62, 64, 84, 98, 100, 116; grants of citizenship: F56, 71, 78; speeches: F56, 67, 72, 79, 81, 92, 103, 104, 106; religion: F79, 99, 119.

[62] Early in 89, the tribune M. Plautius Silvanus (one of the authors of the *lex Plautia Papiria*) carried a law which provided for each tribe to nominate fifteen jurors, who could be senators, *equites*, or members of the *plebs* (Ascon. 61St=79C). F57, 81, and 104 may also refer to this law (cf. comm. ad locc.).

[63] Other fragments that may refer to this campaign include F85, 86, 110, 112 (see comm. ad locc.).

[64] The fall of Herculaneum is dated to 11 June 89 BC (Ovid *fast.* 6.567–8, and comm. on F88–9). F107 may also refer to this event (see comm. ad loc.).

firm context relate to events that are not attested by any other evidence—such as the *lex Calpurnia* (F71) and the grant of citizenship to the Tudertes (F78)—which is not exactly helpful for the present purpose. The only other thing to be said is that none of the evidence we have disproves the notion that book 4 dealt exclusively with the year 89.[65]

The rest of the work is quickly dealt with. Four fragments are attested from book 6, one from book 9, one from book 12, and one from book 23. We have no fragments of book 5, but the identifiable fragments of book 6 deal with events of 88. If (as seems likely) book 3 dealt with 90 and book 4 with 89, it follows that the scale of Sisenna's narrative had begun to expand in the subsequent books. This would suggest that the breadth of treatment increased when he reached the Civil War proper, which started in 88. F132, which refers to an event of 87, has no book number—but assuming that the increased scale of the narrative continued, we have suggested assigning it to book 7 or 8 (see comm. ad loc.). The fragments from book 9 (F133) and book 12 (F134) cannot be assigned to definite contexts, which leaves us with one remaining clue: the election of Sulla to the dictatorship in 82 (F135), which is assigned by Nonius to book 23. If correctly transmitted, this figure would suggest a vast expansion of the scale of the narrative as Sisenna reached the mid-to-late 80s. That is not absolutely impossible, especially if Sulla's actions were given disproportionate attention. It would also follow that if Sisenna went down to the death of Sulla in early 78, as seems likely (see above), the total number of books might have reached around thirty. The alternative is that the book number has been incorrectly transmitted. Book numbers (indeed all numbers) are notoriously liable to corruption, and it may be that the book number of F135 should be altered from *xxiii* to *xiii*[66] or *xviii*,[67] thus implying a more modest expansion and a total number of books of, say, eighteen or twenty-five respectively.

Additional notes

The following notes are designed to provide basic information which will enable the reader better to understand the commentary. They do not claim to be full or original discussions.

ENFRANCHISEMENT LEGISLATION

Short bibliography: Badian, *Studies* (1964), 75–6; *JRS* 63 (1973), 128–30; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*[2] (Oxford, 1973), 150–3; E. Gabba, *Esercito e Società nella tarda repubblica romana* (Florence, 1973), 250–64; G. Luraschi, *SDHI* 44 (1978), 321–70; P. A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1988), 105–8, 132–6; Gabba, *CAH*[2] 9 (1994), 123–8; Mouritsen, *Italian Unification* (1998), 153–71; Pobjoy, 'The first *Italia*' (2000), 195–6; E. Bispham, *From Asculum to Actium* (Oxford, 2007), 161–75.

[65] The point can only be made negatively, and should not be taken to prove, or even to make it probable, that events of 89 were confined to book 4, or that they occupied all of it.

[66] Badian, *Studies*, 213. Calboli (*StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 156) wrongly thinks that the book concerned was Sisenna's last.

[67] Riese, 'Über das Geschichtswerk' (1865), 63–4.

(i) *The* lex Iulia

Appian (*b.c.* 1.49.212–13) talks of a *senatus consultum* enfranchising those who had remained loyal to Rome. The other evidence (see below) makes it clear that Appian is referring to the *lex Iulia de ciuitate*, and since the passage comes between the military narratives for 90 and 89, the Julius concerned must have been L. Julius Caesar, consul in 90.

The other evidence is Cicero *Balb.* 21, saying that under the law *ciuitas est sociis et Latinis data* ('citizenship was granted to the allies and Latins'); Velleius 2.16.4, like Appian not naming the law, but placing it before the victories of Pompeius Strabo, Sulla, and Marius, and saying that it enfranchised those *qui arma aut non ceperant aut deposuerant maturius* ('who either had not taken up arms or who had laid them down in good time'); and Gellius 4.4.3, who says *ciuitas uniuerso Latio lege Iulia data est* ('citizenship was granted to the whole of Latium by the Julian Law'). The generally accepted synthesis of this evidence is that Velleius' formulation gives the essential provisions of the law; it was an attempt to prevent the revolt spreading and the effect was to enfranchise all Latin colonies, except Venusia, which had joined the revolt (App. *b.c.* 1.42.190), together with those Italians who had either not revolted or had laid down their arms.[68] Velleius' phrase *aut deposuerant maturius* probably refers to those who had done so before the passing of the law, not to those who had done so by a specified date after it had been passed. This may seem inconsistent with the fact that, though Appian indicates that the Etruscans and Umbrians, who received citizenship under the law, had not in fact revolted, other evidence makes it clear that they had done so (Livy *per.* 74, Florus 2.6.13, Oros. 5.18.17). The best solution (thus Brunt) is that the Etruscan and Umbrian revolt was in fact very short-lived and perhaps did not involve all the peoples of those areas. (Mouritsen seeks to deny the link between the *lex Iulia* and the revolt in Etruria and Umbria, placing the law in the summer of 90 and regarding it as directed mainly at the Latins, whose support for Rome, he thinks, was less than whole-hearted.)

Cicero (l.c.) makes it clear that an allied city had to accept citizenship—it could not be forced on them. Decisions to grant citizenship may have required votes of senate and people in each case (see comm. on F78).

(ii) *The* lex Plautia Papiria

Sources: Cic. *Arch.* 7, Schol. Bob. 175 St, Vell. 2.17.1.

It is now generally agreed (though Gabba dissents) that this was not a general enabling law, but dealt with a particular category of people, who had probably not been specifically provided for by the *lex Iulia*, those whose names had been added (*adscripti*) to the rolls of a city but were not resident in that city (it was probably mainly Greek cities that were involved). If such persons were resident in Italy, they could acquire Roman citizenship by registering with a praetor within sixty days.

[68] The whole of Cispadane Gaul may have received the citizenship at this time; cf. Sherwin-White, *Roman Citizenship*[2], 157–9.

(iii) *The* lex Calpurnia *(or* leges Calpurniae*)*

The creation of two new tribes is attributed to L. Calpurnius Piso by Sisenna (F38), who also refers to a *lex Calpurnia* that authorised grants of citizenship as a reward to allied soldiers (F71). On the issues raised by these fragments see comm. ad locc.

(iv) *The remaining enfranchisements*

The majority of communities were not covered by any general legislation, and had to wait for votes of senate and, presumably, though it is not specifically mentioned in the sources, people. This appears not to have happened until 87 and no reference to it occurs in the fragments of Sisenna.[69]

THE *LEX VARIA*

Sources: see *MRR* 2. 26–7.
Short bibliography: Gruen, *JRS* 55 (1965), 59–73; Badian, *Historia* 18 (1969), 447–91. The present note largely follows the latter.

In January 90 the tribune Q. Varius Hybrida carried a law establishing a special court to try Roman citizens accused of aiding and abetting the allied revolt against Rome (Appian (*b.c.* 1.37–8.165–9) is clearly mistaken in his view that it was the *lex Varia* which caused the revolt). The existing *quaestiones perpetuae* ('standing courts'), it seems, had been suspended at the beginning of the war.

Of those prosecuted initially L. Calpurnius Bestia (probably the consul of 111) and C. Aurelius Cotta (consul in 75) forestalled a hostile verdict by going into exile. A Mummius, probably a descendant of the consul of 146, was convicted. Q. Pompeius Rufus (cos. 88) was acquitted, while the fate of L. Memmius (see comm. on F31) is uncertain. The elderly M. Aemilius Scaurus (consul in 115) was prosecuted, but either he was acquitted or the case was dropped. Whether M. Antonius (consul in 99) was prosecuted in 90 or 89 is uncertain, but in either case he was acquitted.

The convictions—there may well have been others of which we do not know—eventually caused the senate to suspend the Varian court. The jurors in 90 were all *equites*, as they had been in all the *quaestiones perpetuae* since the passing of the *lex Servilia Glauciae* in, probably, 101. Early in 89, the *lex Plautia* reformed the composition of the juries (see n. 62). The Varian court, if not the others, was reinstated, and Varius himself was prosecuted and convicted (for the possible trial of Cn. Pomponius, tribune in 90, see comm. on F111).

THE COURSE OF THE WAR

Note: the following is based largely on Gabba's commentary on Appian *b.c.* 1.38.170–53.231 and his narrative in *CAH*^{2} 9. Neither of these is easy to follow without a simultaneous

[69] Cf. Brunt, *Fall of the Roman Republic*, 135. T. R. Martin (*SNR* 68 (1989), 37–42) argues that the Samnites did not receive citizenship at this time, and were not citizens when their troops were among those defeated by Sulla at the battle of the Colline Gate in 82. He does not make it clear when, in his opinion, they did become citizens. Allied communities in Transpadane Gaul were given Latin status by a law of Pompeius Strabo in 89 (Ascon. 12St=3C; cf. Plin. *nat.* 3.138). The existing Transpadane Latin colonies of Cremona and Aquileia were probably enfranchised under the provisions of the *lex Iulia* (cf. C. Ewins, *PBSR* 23 (1955), 77).

consultation of the other. For the clearest citation of the evidence see Domaszewski, *SBAW* 201.1 (1924), 16–31.

The Italian revolt began in 91 (Diod. 37.2.2, Eutr. 5.3.1, Oros. 5.18.1), though no military operations of note occurred that year. The outbreak was perhaps marked by the murder at Asculum of Q. Servilius (either *praetor pro consule* in 91 or proconsul in 90), his legate Fonteius, and other Romans. Servilius had become aware of an exchange of hostages between Asculum and other cities (i.e. as a guarantee of their alliance against Rome).

90 BC

The consuls in 90 were L. (constantly called Sextus by Appian) Julius Caesar and P. Rutilius Lupus, and the chief Italian commanders were Q. Poppaedius Silo in the north of the war zone and C. Papius Mutilus in the south. Each side had a number of subordinate commanders who will be encountered in what follows and in the commentary.

At the end of 91 the allies had begun the siege of the Latin colonies Aesernia and Alba Fucens (Livy *per.* 72). P. Vettius Scato defeated L. Caesar, who was trying to relieve Aesernia, and then moved on the city. The Roman commanders at Aesernia fled and after a long siege it eventually fell (App. *b.c.* 1.41.182, Livy *per.* 72–3, Oros. 5.18.11, 14; cf. commentary on F4, 12 13 and below on relief efforts).

M. Egnatius captured Venafrum on the borders of Latium, Campania, and Samnium, a little to the south-west of Aesernia (App. *b.c.* 1.41.183), while P. Presenteius defeated C. Perperna (ibid.).[70] M. Lamponius defeated P. Licinius Crassus and pursued him to Grumentum (App. *b.c.* 1.41.184; Grumentum may have been captured earlier by the allies, but recaptured by Rome[71]).

Papius Mutilus captured Nola and persuaded the Roman soldiers there to join him; he then captured a number of towns on the Campanian coast, but was unable to take Acerrae (App. *b.c.* 1.42.185–7).

Gabba places here an episode narrated later by Appian (*b.c.* 1.47.204): Vidacilius, Lafrenius and Ventidius defeated Pompeius Strabo near Falerio Picens and chased him to Firmum. Strabo had probably earlier tried to take Asculum.[72] If Gabba is right, Vidacilius moved south and was joined by Canusium, Venusia and other cities (App. *b.c.* 1.42.190).

In June 90 came the important battle of the river Tolenus, between Vettius Scato on the Italian side and the consul Rutilius and Marius on the Roman side. The consul fell, but Marius inflicted a defeat on Scato (App. *b.c.* 1.43.191–5, Ovid *fast.* 6.563; other sources at Gabba, *Comm.* 139).

Rutilius was replaced as commander (no suffect consul was elected) by Q. Servilius Caepio, who was tricked by Silo, fell into an ambush and was killed (App. *b.c.* 1.44.196–8). L. Caesar, probably trying to relieve Aesernia (see above), was defeated by Marius Egnatius, but won a victory against Papius while attempting to relieve Acerrae (App. *b.c.* 1.45.199–200, 42.188–9).[73]

[70] Gabba (*Comm.* 135), following Carcopino, thinks that Perperna was trying to relieve Alba Fucens.
[71] Cf. Gabba, *Comm.* 135 and comm. on F32.
[72] Gabba, *Comm.* 143. [73] For the chronology see ibid. 136–7.

Marius, with the support of Sulla, won a victory over the Marsi (App. *b.c.* 1.46.201–2, Livy *per.* 73, Plut. *Mar.* 33.3, Oros. 5.18.15). In the autumn Pompeius Strabo, perhaps after an attempt to relieve him at Firmum by Sex. Julius Caesar, the consul of 91, forced the enemy to retreat to Asculum and he and Sextus began its siege (App. *b.c.* 1.47.206, 48.210).

Late in the year the revolt spread to Etruria and Umbria, but seems to have been shortlived and rather half-hearted (cf. above, on the *lex Iulia*). The Etruscans and Umbrians were quick to accept the citizenship when it was offered under the *lex Iulia*, and such resistance as remained was ended by L. Porcius Cato in Etruria and A. Plotius in Umbria (Liv. *Per.* 74; Flor. 2.6.13; Oros. 5.18.17, and see comm. on F36).

89 BC

During the winter Pompeius Strabo, now consul, won a substantial victory over an army—perhaps of Marsi, led by Vettius Scato[74]—which had, in ignorance of what had happened, come to help the Etruscans and Umbrians (App. *b.c.* 1.50.216). The other consul, L. Porcius Cato, defeated the Marsi in the area of the Fucine Lake, but died in battle, killed, it was said, by the son of Marius (Livy *per.* 75, App. *b.c.* 1.50.217, Oros. 5.18.24; cf. comm. on F127).

These victories appear to have broken resistance in the northern theatre. Corfinium, the rebels' capital, was abandoned (Diod. 37.2.9), and the Marsi, Marrucini, and Vestini submitted, though the process was probably not completed until 88 (App. *b.c.* 1.52.227, Livy *per.* 75–6, Oros. 5.18.25; further details in Gabba, *Comm.* 154–5).

Meanwhile, in the south, Sulla besieged Pompeii and, after an initial reverse at the hands of Cluentius (App. *b.c.* 1.50.218), defeated him decisively and captured it, Stabiae, and Herculaneum (details in Gabba, *Comm.*, 150–1). Aec(u)lanum and the rest of the territory of the Hirpini then surrendered to him (App. *b.c.* 1.51.222–3, Gabba, *Comm.*, 152). Sulla then moved against the Samnites, and captured Bovianum,[75] whither the rebel capital had been moved from Corfinium; it now moved again, to Aesernia (details in Gabba, *Comm.*, 153). Further successes, perhaps earlier in the year, were won by C. Cosconius in Apulia (App. *b.c.* 1.52.227–9), though Venusia did not fall until the following year.[76] Shortly before 17 November, Strabo finally captured Asculum (for sources see *MRR* 2, 32).

88–87 BC

Some further Roman victories belong to 88, while the Samnites and Lucanians continued their resistance until granted citizenship by the Marian regime in 87.

(JB)

[74] Ibid. 148; this depends on Cic. *Phil.* 12.27.

[75] A. La Regina (*RhM* 109 (1966), 260–86) has established that there was only one Bovianum, and that the distinction between *Bovianum Vetus* and *Bovianum Undecimanorum* should be rejected.

[76] Gabba, *Comm.* 156.

27

C. Licinius Macer

Editions: Peter 1^2, cccl–ccclxv, 298–307; S. Walt, *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer: Einleitung, Fragmente, Kommentar* (Stuttgart, 1997); Chassignet 3. l–lxiii, 89–103; Beck–Walter 2. 314–45.

Principal discussions: M. A. Weichert, *Commentatio de C. Licinio Calvo* (Grimae, 1825), 5–13; id., *Poetarum Latinorum Hostii, Laevii, C. Licinii Calvi . . . aliorumque vitae et carminum reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1830), 92–105; H. Meyer, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Zurich, 1833), 175–6 (2nd edn. 1842), 385–7); H. Liebaldt, *C. Licinius Macer* (Progr. Naumburg, 1848); K. W. Nitzsch, *Die römische Annalistik* (Berlin, 1873), esp. 336–7, 351–5; G. Scaramella, 'I più antichi Licini e l'annalista C. Licinio Macro', *ASNP* 12 (1897), 5–30; W. Soltau, 'Macer und Tubero', *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 409–31, 639–52; O. Seeck, *Die Kalendertafel der Pontifices* (Berlin, 1885), 43–53; A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* 5 (Leipzig, 1894), 531–5; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 136–7; Münzer, 'C. Licinius (112) Macer', *RE* 13 (1926), 428–35; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 319–21; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 258–60; R. M. Ogilvie, 'Livy, Licinius Macer and the *libri lintei*', *JRS* 48 (1958), 40–8; id., *Comm.* (1965), 7–12; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 22; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 287–8; B. W. Frier, 'Licinius Macer and the *consules suffecti* of 444 BC', *TAPhA* 105 (1975), 79–97, esp. 90–7; M. J. Hodgkinson, 'C. Licinius Macer and the history of the early republic', unpublished thesis, Exeter (1997); W. Kierdorf *DNP* 7 (1999), 168–9; T. P. Wiseman, 'Roman history and the ideological vacuum', in T. P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2002), 285–310, esp. 295–302 (=Wiseman, *Remembering the Roman People* (Oxford, 2009), 5–32, esp. 19–24).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Macer's date of birth is unknown, but, if he was indeed praetor in 68 BC (see below), then he must have been born at least thirty-nine years earlier, i.e. in or before 107 BC. His coins show that he was the son of an otherwise unknown Lucius. To his own son,[1] also called Gaius, the future orator, poet, and friend of Catullus, he gave the *cognomen* Calvus,[2] thereby claiming descent from the Licinii Calvi, who had held the consular tribunate in the early years of the fourth century and then, in the case of C. Licinius Calvus, the consulship in either 364 or 361 BC (see *MRR sub annis*). There is no reason to doubt the claim, but the family seems to have been obscure for many years. Macer himself appears in history first as a moneyer in 84 BC.[3] If Pliny (*nat.* 7.165) is correct, then Calvus was born in 82.

[1] That Calvus was his son is stated at Val. Max. 9.12.7.

[2] At *Q. f.* 2.4.1 Cicero calls him Macer, suggesting that he bore two *cognomina*.

[3] For the coins that he produced see Crawford, *RRC* 370, with plate xlvi.

Thanks to the survival of a famous extract from Sallust's *Histories* (3.48), we know that Macer was tribune of the plebs in 73 BC when he campaigned to free the tribunate from the shackles that Sulla had placed on it. Sallust ascribes to him a fiery speech delivered at one of his *contiones*. As almost always with ancient historians, the words of the speech will be the historian's own,[4] and Sallust may also have invented its occasion; but the sentiments almost certainly reflect Macer's own political views.[5] His *popularis* politics were perhaps inspired by the example of his distant ancestors.

Macer died as a *uir praetorius* (Val. Max. 9.12.7). Since in 66 he was *repetundarum reus* (Val. Max. loc. cit.) in a court presided over by Cicero as praetor, he must have governed an (unidentifiable) province: this makes 68 the likeliest year for the praetorship, with the governorship in 67. Unless he held posts as a legate of which we are otherwise uninformed or had reason to write to the senate as quaestor, his governorship of a province is the obvious context for the fragment of a letter preserved at Non. 258–9 M = 395 L (= Macer fr.27 Walt), which may be a response to criticism of his governorship.

Two sources refer to Macer's trial: according to Valerius Maximus (loc. cit.) he watched the sorting of the votes from the Maeniana and, before Cicero could pronounce him guilty, sent word that he was about to commit suicide *non damnatus sed reus*, thereby avoiding the confiscation of his property. According to Plutarch (*Cic.* 9.1–2), while the jury was coming to its verdict, Macer, confident of success, went home and removed the signs of mourning characteristic of defendants in order to appear in the Forum as the victor. However, at his door he met one of his advocates, his fellow *popularis* Crassus (also a Licinius), who told him that he was convicted by all the votes of the jury, whereupon he turned round and dropped down dead. According to Plutarch, Cicero was generally thought to have handled the trial well. Cicero himself says the same, stating (*Att.* 1.4.2) that he was *aequus* ('well-disposed') to Macer but gained far more credit from the populace for his conviction than he would have done had he used his *gratia* to secure an acquittal; this may help to explain the later coolness between Cicero and Calvus. Plainly the accounts of Valerius Maximus and Plutarch are incompatible, and at least one of them must be wrong. Almost all scholars rightly prefer Plutarch: he researched diligently before writing his late republican lives, whereas Valerius often prefers the sensational to the accurate.

Apart from Sallust's invented speech, we know a little about Macer's oratory. In his sketch at *Brut.* 238 Cicero states that he worked hard, gathered and marshalled his facts carefully and precisely, but ruined the good impression that this made by his demeanour, somewhat shady character, and the impression of a rather doubtful cunning. Of actual speeches made by Macer we know of just two.[6]

[4] Note some nice allusions to Macer's own history of early Rome at §§1 and 15; see Syme, *Sallust*, 200, 207; Walt 14, 17; Wiseman in Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress* (2002), 297–8 = *Remembering the Roman People* (2009), 19–20.

[5] See Syme, *Sallust*, 200; Hodgkinson, *C. Licinius Macer* (1997), 44–56; Wiseman in Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress* (2002), 301 = *Remembering the Roman People* (2009), 23–4, the last correcting any misleading impression that may be given by Walt 13–14.

[6] See Cic. *Rab. perd.* 7 (Cicero tells us that Macer had prosecuted C. Rabirius, to whom he was *inimicus*, accusing him of violating sacred places and groves, but that the judges had not accepted his arguments; presumably, as in the later prosecution of Rabirius by Labienus. Macer referred to the events surrounding the death of Saturninus in 100) and Prisc. *GL* 2.532 (from a *Pro Tuscis*).

Work

Most scholars assume without argument that the politician and the Macer who wrote history are one and the same.[7] In the absence of direct testimony[8] the assumption cannot be proved, but Cicero's statement (*leg.* 1.7=T1) that Sisenna was a friend of the historian provides a chronological context precisely contemporary with that known for the politician, and the assumption is here accepted.[9]

In five of the cited fragments Macer's historical work is given a title: in F2 it is termed *historiae*, in F4–6 and F8 *annales*. Therefore it is quite likely to have borne the title *Annales* (there is no difficulty in arguing that in his citation of F2 Macrobius was writing loosely).[10] However, it has often been demonstrated elsewhere in this work how unreliable our evidence is on this matter.[11]

The scope, economy, and date of composition of the work are all problematic.[12]

Amidst much that is unknown, it is certain (*a*) that Macer's history extended at least until 299 BC, the date of the events covered in F24–5; (*b*) that it included the tale of Romulus in book 1 (see F1–2, and perhaps F4); and (*c*) that it included at least sixteen books, since F8, of unknown context, is cited from book 16 (but one must allow for the possibility of textual corruption).[13] Livy's failure to cite Macer in books 21–45 makes it more likely than not that his history did not reach 218 BC.[14] However, F7 causes difficulty. If it refers to Pyrrhus and the time of the Pyrrhic War, as it apparently does, and if it is correctly ascribed to Macer, Priscian's reference to book 2 cannot be right: Macer cannot have narrated the Pyrrhic War in book 2, unless his books were vastly larger than those of Livy and unless Priscian's reference to book 16 in F8 is wrong.[15] Nevertheless, the fragment seems to suggest that Macer's history extended to the Pyrrhic War. Therefore it is probable but not quite certain that Macer wrote a history in at least sixteen books that stretched from the beginnings of Rome until some point between 299 and 219 BC.

Walt 117 well notes that the detail implicit in the fragments relating to Romulus (FF 1–3, 9, 12) and Tarquinius Priscus (F13) suggests that Macer told this part of the regal period at much greater length than Livy. The scale of this part of his work may even have approached that of Cn. Gellius and DH; certainly, if the rest of the work did cover more than sixteen books and yet failed to reach 218, it must in general have been on a scale as large as Livy's.[16]

[7] However, Popma (149) separated the two, and Cornell (*JRS* 89 (1999), 229) has recently suggested that the question should remain open.

[8] The only fragment that refers to Macer's *praenomen* is F7, and even then *C.* is not certainly attested by the MSS: see our critical *apparatus*.

[9] If the historian and politician are the same, the friendship with Sisenna and Crassus shows that Macer was not hostile to all who had supported Sulla.

[10] Thus Peter 1. ccclii. [11] See e.g. introduction to Piso (9), I. 234–5.

[12] See further esp. Peter 1. ccclii–ccclv; Walt 105–19.

[13] Book numbers are often corrupted in MS traditions (see further below on F7). Another fragment cited with a book number is F6, from book 2, but once again the context cannot be identified.

[14] For this argument, see e.g. Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 414. However, Livy perhaps tired of using Macer, and Peter (ccclv) thought that his history continued 'usque ad suam aetatem'.

[15] *Contra* Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 259, who thinks emendation 'imprudent'. Chassignet (3. lvi) thinks that Priscian's MSS may have made mistakes with regard to both book numbers.

[16] For further discussion of the scale of Macer's work, see comm. on F18.

When Macer started to write the work is unknown, but if F14 really reflects the *ouatio* of Crassus in 71 BC (see commentary) it will have been late in his life.[17] That he died with the history incomplete is quite possible, indeed an attractive view if he had not reached 503 BC (the year to which F14 relates) before 71, with a praetorship and governorship to follow.[18]

The most sure method of learning about the characteristics of Macer's history is to study the fragments themselves, and in what follows most arguments put forward with confidence will be based on these fragments. However, since Macer was a source of Livy and DH, from which two writers come most of our fragments, it is in principle reasonable to make inferences from the extant fragments in their works about Macer's possible connection with other passages. Nevertheless, since in practice several modern scholars have been audacious in their use of this approach, a discussion of its limitations is a necessary preface to a study of the characteristics of Macer's history.

The first difficulty is that our extant fragments and testimonia tell us very little indeed about the Roman writers whom Livy and DH used as sources, and therefore it is quite hard at any given point to discern the characteristics of these lost writers in the extant narratives of the two Augustan historians. In general, the traditional manner in which source-criticism of Livy and Dionysius was carried out in the period *c.*1860–1945 rests upon rather speculative circular arguments.[19] For scholars have sought to determine the characteristics of such writers as Macer, Valerius Antias, and Quintus Aelius Tubero as much from the evidence of other passages of Livy and DH as from the extant fragments; then they have argued on the basis of these alleged characteristics that other passages in these authors were taken from the same source.[20] Second, traditional source criticism has tended to rest on the premiss that Livy and DH used one primary source at a time. Although this assumption is not absurd, especially for Livy who in large stretches of his text in books 31–45 plainly uses only Polybius, it is not certain, and most recent scholars would argue that Livy blended his Roman annalistic sources.[21] If this blending occurred, it becomes very much harder to label passages as derivative from a particular annalistic source.

Third, there is the problem of Tubero (no. 38), who was certainly used by both Livy and Dionysius. Klotz drew attention to the fact that information from Valerius

[17] On the other hand, as Wiseman points out (in *Remembering the Roman People* (2009) 22 (=Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress* (2002), 300 and 79), Macer was an active politician, and a late start does not allow him much time before his death to write sixteen books.

[18] But Frier, *TAPhA* 105 (1975), 95, prefers to argue that the history was always intended to stop with the *lex Hortensia* of *c.*287 and its immediate aftermath (in which the Pyrrhic War could be included).

[19] Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, is the summation of some three generations of scholarship on Livy and the annalists, but for a later flowering of techniques popular in this period see e.g. Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 40–8, and *Comm.* For criticism of this kind of source-criticism, see e.g. Briscoe, *Comm.* 1. 1–12; cf. I. 291 n. 21; Luce, *Livy*, 158–81; Oakley, cited I. 261 n. 38; Walt 100–5.

[20] The classic instance of this procedure concerns Valerius Antias, whose work is customarily discerned behind many passages in which the Valerii are handled favourably. This view is not necessarily wrong, but it rests entirely on inference, and there is no external evidence for it. See further introduction to Antias (no. 25), I. 302.

[21] For Livy's combining sources see, in addition to the works cited above, Briscoe in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Livy* (London, 1971), 10. *Contra* e.g. Ogilvie, *Comm.* 5.

Antias and Macer could in theory have come to Livy and Dionysius via him,[22] and in both F20 and F25 of Macer Tubero is also cited by Livy. In which case, innovations made by Macer may still be present, but they will not have come direct from him, and they may have been adapted or even garbled.[23] From all this it follows that it is unwise to argue that large stretches of Macer's (or any other annalist's) text survive almost unscathed in Livy and DH.[24]

The best-known feature of Macer's history is his use of the *libri lintei* ('linen books') as a source.[25] There are four references to these books in Livy and one in DH: in F18, F20, and F21 Livy tells us that Macer used them as a source; at 4.13.7 (F19) Livy refers to the books and, although he does not mention Macer by name, there is little doubt that he derived his information about them from him (although Tubero is also a possibility; see below); and DH (11.62.3) refers to *ταῖς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν τε καὶ ἀποθέτων βίβλων μαρτυρίαις* ('the evidence of the sacred and secret books'): since this passage is parallel to F18, DH's *βίβλοι* are clearly the *libri lintei*. The only passage in which the books are associated with anyone other than Macer is F20=Tubero 38 F8, in which Livy records that Macer and Tubero reported them differently. Apart from the information which they provide on early Roman history, we are told only that Macer found them in the temple of Juno Moneta (F18–20), and that he repeatedly adduced them as a source (F20).

It is disputed whether the information provided by the *libri lintei* is reliable. Some scholars have taken quite a high view of their reliability and utility;[26] some of those who have rejected their information have even argued that Macer invented the very existence of the books.[27] There are two major difficulties for anyone who would like to believe in the fundamental reliability of the information provided by the books: (*a*) in two (F18=DH 11.62.3, F20) of the four episodes for which their testimony is cited it conflicts with that found in Livy's older sources, and there is good reason to prefer these older sources (see commentary); (*b*) in a third (F19) they provide information about a *praefectus annonae* which there is good reason to disbelieve. It is uncertain whether Livy has reported most or even all of the discrepancies from the *communis opinio* that he found in Macer; that he has not is suggested by certain implausible eccentricities in books 4 and 5, especially as regards the names of magistrates, for whose derivation from Macer Ogilvie has made a reasonable case.[28]

Nevertheless, even if the *libri lintei* were not a source of any great quality, it is unlikely that Macer invented their existence.[29] Certainly our reports of what was in

[22] Klotz, *RhM* 87 (1938), 42–50; *Mnemosyne* ser. 3.6 (1938), 102; *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, 208–11; *RhM* 90 (1941), 304–6.

[23] This possibility is underestimated by many writers, including Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 40–8.

[24] Some possible exceptions to this general rule are noted below; see too comm. on F18.

[25] The fullest recent discussion of the *libri lintei* is Walt 75–85; further bibliography is cited below.

[26] See e.g. Frier, *TAPhA* 105 (1975), 88–9.

[27] Very influential on subsequent scholarship was Mommsen, *Chron.*[2] 93–8; see e.g. Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 137.

[28] See Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 40–8.

[29] Many of the arguments which follow were presented forcefully by Peter 1. ccclvi–ccclvii (already in the first edition of 1870, ccclxxxxv–ccclxxxxvi). For other early post-Mommsenian defences of the genuineness of the *libri*, see Scaramella, *ASNP* 12 (1897), 20; Soltau *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 412–13.

the books do not suggest any very compelling motives for invention: if Macer needed a bogus source to give credibility to a radical interpretation of early Roman history, one would have expected Livy to cite him for matters more colourful than suffect consuls in 444 and a repeated consular college in 435–434, for the invention of neither of which is a motive readily apparent. Klotz argued that Macer must have invented the books because their testimony diverges from that of the older annals;[30] these divergences do suggest that the testimony of the books is wrong (see above) but hardly prove that they are an invention by Macer.[31]

The only plausible reason that Macer should have invented the existence of the *libri* is to triumph over earlier historians by adducing a source which they had neglected.[32] Yet if he did this he must have created several bogus problems of no great consequence (including the suffect consulship and the repeated consulship) simply to parade the testimony of his invented books;[33] and the invention could easily have been detected. Furthermore, unless Livy is muddled, Tubero (38 F8=Macer F20) also cited the books: although this citation causes certain difficulties, he may have consulted them himself; even if his citation was at second hand, he plainly did not think them a bogus invention (see comm. ad locc.).

Walt observed that Macer's exploitation of the *libri* is of a piece with antiquarian tendencies that can be seen in various of the fragments (see below).[34] The motives that impelled Macer to write his history can only be conjectured (see further below), but the discovery of the *libri lintei* may have been prominent amongst them.[35] Klotz's view[36] that he wrote in reaction to Quadrigarius' history, which had excluded events before 390, also deserves serious consideration.[37] We cannot be certain which of the two writers has priority;[38] but if Quadrigarius did write first, Macer may indeed have believed that in the *libri lintei* he had a tool with which to champion the traditions about Rome before 390.[39]

On balance it seems unlikely that Macer invented the *libri*, although that does not mean that he did not occasionally invent details and adduce the *libri* as his authority. But even if the *libri* were not an invention, it is far from clear what exactly they were, or from what period they date. That they were not a list merely of eponymous magistrates is shown by their references to censors and a *praefectus annonae*; but this observation does not get us far, since we know virtually nothing about the form taken by Roman republican lists of magistrates.[40] That they are cited only for the period

[30] Klotz, *RhM* 86 (1937), 218.

[31] Before Mommsen scholars took a more kindly attitude to the *libri*: Krause, 236, for example, held that the use of the *libri* showed Macer's diligence as a historian. See Walt 78.

[32] This motive is hinted at by Timpe, *A&A* 25 (1979), 104.

[33] This point is made well by Walt 79–80.

[34] Walt 81. Compare the remark of Krause cited in n. 31.

[35] See Badian, 'Early historians', 22.

[36] Klotz, *RhM* 86 (1937), 219, developed further by Frier, *TAPhA* 105 (1975), 91–7.

[37] See also Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 23.

[38] See Walt 81.

[39] Rejection of Klotz's view that Macer invented the *libri* does not necessarily entail rejection of his argument about Quadrigarius. Peter (1. ccclviii) held that Macer used the evidence of the *libri lintei* against Antias. If Antias did indeed write before him, this may also have been the case.

[40] The *fasti Capitolini*, it may be observed, record censors. For the *libri magistratuum* of Tuditanus, to which the *libri lintei* have sometimes been compared (e.g. by Kornemann, *Klio* 11 (1911), 255), see introduction to Tuditanus (no. 10), and comm. on 10 F1–2.

444–428 makes it quite attractive to argue, but is far from proving, that by Macer's day they were a fragmentary list that did not continue into the fourth century BC. That they date from the fifth century itself is improbable, since linen is unlikely to have survived from *c.*428 to *c.*70. Peter (1. cccIvii) thought that they were compiled after the Gallic Sack of 390, at which time errors and interpolations were introduced into them. This view perhaps takes too seriously what Livy says at 6.1.10 but cannot be proved wrong merely by pointing out that the temple of Juno Moneta was founded only in 344: the books could have been deposited there after its founding, just as medieval monasteries housed manuscripts originally written elsewhere. Ogilvie held that they were written in the second century, while Frier, in line with his optimistic view of their reliability, suggested that they were written between the foundation of the temple of Moneta and its conversion into a mint *c.*269.[41] Despite some reservations noted above, none of these views can be refuted, none confirmed.

Another important aspect of Macer's history is its use of antiquarian material.[42] Antiquarianism had been part of ancient historiography ever since Herodotus, and it is wrong to draw a firm distinction between the techniques of early Roman antiquarians and early Roman historians, who often incorporated antiquarian subject matter. In this they were followed by Livy and especially DH. Therefore it is no surprise to find that in several of the fragments Macer includes material and uses techniques that would be at home in antiquarian literature: the Parentalia and its connection with Acca Larentia is explained in F2; certain aspects of the calendar in F10 and 11; the origin of the dictatorship in Alba Longa in F15; and the first ovation in F14.[43]

Macer's Romulean date for all but the last of these illustrates another characteristic of the Roman annalistic and antiquarian tradition: there was a tendency to place as many institutions as possible in regal, and especially Romulean, times, thereby dignifying them with both great antiquity and the imprimatur of the founder. F9–11 and F15 show that Macer described a Romulean Rome that already had a developed constitutional system. This is the case also with DH (with Livy to a somewhat lesser extent), and was probably true of several other annalistic accounts. As Walt (175) says, Romulus in Macer must have been the equivalent of a Greek *nomothetes*. F14 may show the retrojection to the early republic of a practice adopted in 71 BC. If so, this should perhaps be regarded as a phenomenon parallel to the retrojection of material to Romulus' reign; but F14 may be explained also as a compliment to one of Macer's friends: see the commentary.

Consonant with Macer's antiquarian interests is his seeking out and use of new raw material in the form of the *libri lintei* and his citation of the *foedus Ardeatinum* (F18).[44]

[41] Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 46; *Comm.*, 544–5; Frier, *TAPhA* 105 (1975), 88–9. The view of Frier and Ogilvie that ultimately the *libri* must go back to the same source as other lists of magistrates is very far from certain: there may have been more than one list of magistrates at Rome.

[42] See in general the excellent remarks of Walt 169–84; also Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* 5 (1894), 533–5; Peter 1. cccIv.

[43] Compare the (slightly different) remarks of Frier, *TAPhA* 105 (1975), 95.

[44] For the possibility that Macer knew of the treaty from the *libri lintei*, see comm. Since Macer was interested in the treaty with Ardea, it was not absurd of Peter (1. cccIvi) to suggest that DH owed his knowledge of the Gabine and Latin treaties to him (respectively 4.58.4 and 6.95.1–3).

Since many historians did not bother with documentary research of this kind, he has been praised for his diligence.[45] Yet uncertainty about the reliability of the material invoked by Macer makes it hard to determine how far this praise is merited.

Another antiquarian technique, which has its origin in fifth-century Greece, is the rationalizing approach to myth, in which the divine and supernatural are explained away. In the attested fragments of Macer this is seen above all in those that deal with the birth of Romulus and Remus and their foundation of Rome: see the comm. on F1 and F3; but Macer may have rejected also the mythical version of Romulus' death and the appearance of the Dioscuri at Regillus: see comm. on F15–16.[46] However, the scanty remains of the early Roman historians make it dangerous to state that Macer showed more antiquarian tendencies than other historians of his time.

On three occasions (F13, F16, F17) DH cites Macer together with Cn. Gellius, which makes it very likely that Macer used Gellius as a source; if DH knew of Gellius only through his reading of Macer, then this would be a certainty. The fragments of Gellius reveal their author's antiquarian and rationalizing interests, and doubtless Macer found these congenial. However, Gellius' history is most celebrated today for its great length, and Macer's use of it may explain his apparently voluminous regal narrative.[47]

Livy tells us (7.9.5=F22) that Macer distorted the events surrounding the nomination of a dictator in 361 to add to the glory of his family, a report that there is no reason to disbelieve (see comm.). Such behaviour seems not to have been uncharacteristic of ancient historians: whatever one may think of the modern view that the prominence of the Valerii in our sources for early Roman history owes much to Valerius Antias (see I. 300, 302), Livy himself suppressed information that was to the discredit of Livii, even though he was almost certainly not related to them.[48] The absence of another such remark about Macer makes it difficult to prove conclusively that he behaved in the same way elsewhere. Nevertheless, it would be surprising if his pen does not lie behind at least some of the material in the following Livian episodes, in which the Calvi of the years 400–395 are portrayed notably favourably: the election of P. Licinius Calvus in 400 as (allegedly) the first plebeian consular tribune (Liv. 5.12.8–13);[49] the election of Calvus to a second tribunate for 396 and his resignation in favour of his son (5.18.1–6); and the report that this son in the senate asked for the opinion of his father before that of all others (5.20.4).[50] Another possibility

[45] See e.g. Bardon, *Lit. inconnue*, 1. 260.

[46] For further passages of DH (2.31.1 (on the motive for the Sabine rape), 45–6 (different versions of the end of the Sabine War), 60.5–61.1 (Numa and Egeria)) that exhibit this rationalizing approach and could conceivably derive from Macer, see Walt 163–5.

[47] For Gellius, see I. 253–5. For use of Gellius by Macer, see further Peter I. ccclix; Badian, 'Early historians', 22; and esp. Walt 85–7. For the possibility that DH knew Gellius through Macer (conceivable, even though such arguments are now unfashionable in the case of DH's contemporary Livy), see Walt 86 and Chassignet 3. lviii n. 287.

[48] See conveniently Walsh, *Livy*, 153.

[49] However, in the first passage Livy mentions (but not by name) the views of at least two sources on the reasons for the choice of Calvus. If these sources are Macer and Tubero, then this poses no difficulty for the invention of the whole tale by Macer, since Tubero wrote after Macer. If one of them is Antias and Antias wrote after Macer, then this remains true; but if one of them is Antias and Antias wrote before Macer, then the notice concerning Calvus' election obviously goes back to writers earlier than Macer.

[50] On which see Mommsen, *RF* 1. 266; Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 44; note that as a result of this *sententia* the plebeians praise the *Licinia familia* at 5.21.1–2.

concerns the election of the first tribunes of the plebs in 493. Livy (2.33.2–3) writes: *ita tribuni plebei creati duo, C. Licinius et L. Albinius; hi tres collegas sibi creauerunt, in his Sicinium fuisse, seditionis auctorem; de duobus, qui fuerint, minus conuenit.* (3) *sunt qui duos tantum in Sacro monte creatos tribunos esse dicant, ibique sacratam legem latam* ('Thus two tribunes of the plebs were elected, C. Licinius and L. Albinius. These men appointed three more as their colleagues. One of these was Sicinius, who had started the insurrection, but there is less agreement about who the other two were. (3) Some say that only two tribunes were elected on the Sacred Mount, and that the sacred law was carried there'). DH (6.89.1) mentions L. Junius Brutus and C. Sicinius, who were the current plebeian leaders, and then C. and P. Licinius and C. Viscellius Ruga. Plainly at least one of the sources used by Livy and DH must have invented material, and therefore C. Licinius perhaps owes his position in Livy's account to Macer. C. Licinius Stolo and C. Licinius Calvus were prominent at the time of the passing of the Licinio-Sextian rogations in 367/6 (see Livy 6.34–42); although distortion by Macer cannot be proved, their prominence is likely to owe something to him.[51]

As for political attitudes in general, Mommsen conjectured that Macer's history reflected his politics in being pro-plebeian in character.[52] Even though it rests on no direct testimony, the thesis has been widely adopted by later scholars,[53] and indeed it is hard to believe that a *popularis*, who called his own son Calvus after members of his family who had been leading plebeian activists, and to whom Sallust ascribed allusions to the achievements of the early plebeians, should have written a history that was entirely neutral.[54] Therefore the general proposition that many passages in Livy and DH in which the plebeians are portrayed sympathetically, or at least in which their agitation and grievances are recounted, may derive ultimately from Macer is quite attractive,[55] but caution is required in accepting it: for the reasons already given, it is rarely possible to prove such an origin for any particular passage;[56] and, even if one grants a possible origin in Macer, these passages have certainly been mediated to us

[51] On this topic see further e.g. Peter 1. ccclvii–ccclviii; Ogilvie, *Comm.* 9; Walt 184–91; for the Licinio-Sextian rogations see Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome* (Exeter, 2004), 200. Walt analyses some other episodes in Livy and DH in which Licinii are involved but shows that distortion by Macer is not easily isolated.

[52] Mommsen, *Chron.*[2] 98; *RF* 1. 315.

[53] See e.g. Scaramella, *ASNP* 12 (1897), 20–1; Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 417–23; Hodgkinson, *C. Licinius Macer* (1997), *passim* (the latter two with extensive working out of the hypothesis); Wiseman in Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress* (2002), 299 (= *Remembering the Roman People* (2009), 22).

[54] *Contra* Walt 79, 103–4 and T. J. Cornell, in G. Zecchini (ed.), *'Partiti' e fazioni nell'esperienza politica romana* (Milan, 2009), 15–27. However, the example of Sallust, whom they adduce, is not necessarily decisive against this argument: although his historical works are not obviously biased towards either *optimates* or *populares*, they are politically extremely committed, especially in their treatment of Sulla and their scathing criticism of the nobility; and Sallust did not have ancestors who had played an important part in the Struggle of the Orders.

[55] See Scaramella, *ASNP* 12 (1897), 21; Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 409–32, 639–52, *passim*. Cornell (cit. n. 54, 20–1, 24–7) rightly notes that, since the plebeian cause was in many respects self-evidently right, most annalists must have been to some extent sympathetic to it; and at 16–19 he rightly argues that pro-plebeian speeches in Livy and DH prove nothing, since both authors were accomplished rhetoricians. However, a broadly pro-plebeian tone may be found also in passages that do not contain speeches, such as Liv. 2.23.1–15; 6.34.1–4; 7.21.5–8.

[56] The same is true for many of the passages cited by Ogilvie, *Comm.* 10–11, in which he discerns comment on contemporary political issues.

via Livy and DH (themselves sometimes sympathetic), and perhaps also via Antias or Tubero (again, perhaps sometimes sympathetic).

Strasburger noted the appearance of the motif of *concordia ordinum* in some passages of Livy which for different reasons may be connected with Macer.[57] At 4.7.5, part of the passage to which F18 relates, the Ardeates are informed by the Roman senate that an unfair judgement made against them by the Roman people cannot be rescinded because it would upset the *concordia ordinum*; at 5.12.12 Livy reports that some of his sources held that the election of P. Licinius Calvus to the consular tribunate was owed to a speech that he had made about *concordia ordinum*; at 5.18.3 P. Licinius Calvus declines his own election and recommends that of his son in a speech that begins *omen concordiae, Quirites, rei maxime in hoc tempus utilis, memoria nostri magistratus uos his comitiis petere in insequentem annum uideo*. There are difficulties: the motif of *concordia ordinum* was common enough in Roman political thought of the second and first centuries BC and, amongst historians, Macer can hardly have been alone in employing it; the problems of interpreting F18 are so great (see comm.) that one cannot be certain that Livy's comment at 4.7.5 derives from Macer; and at 5.12.12 there is no guarantee that Macer was the source to whom Livy was referring. Nevertheless, the appearance of the motif twice in the context of P. Licinius Calvus is probably not accidental, and this allows the argument that Macer's championship of the plebeians was coupled with the insistence that they were not responsible for breaches of *concordia ordinum*. It is possible, too, that several other references to *concordia ordinum* in Livy's first decade derive from Macer.

Among other claims that have been made for Macer's history, four texts have been adduced to support the argument that Macer had a special interest in and knowledge of the history of the Fabii, and even that he had access to Fabian records, none of much cogency.[58] First, in F25 Fabius Rullianus is glorified. This glorification does allow the inference that very similar passages later in Livy book 10 may go back to Macer (see comm.), but Livy devotes a very great deal of space to the career of Rullianus, and Macer can hardly have been alone in glorifying the most famous Roman between Camillus and Fabius' own great-grandson. At F23 Macer claims to know that the Faucia *curia* held the *principium* in the year of the Cremera, which was the scene of a famous Fabian defeat in 477; but he says nothing about use of Fabian records, and the claim may be an invention. Livy (6.34.5–11) tells us that Licinius Stolo, who may not have been an ancestor of Macer but in whom he is likely to have taken a great interest, was married to a Fabia: this provides a motive for goodwill towards the Fabii, but little more. Ogilvie noted that C. Licinius Geta and Q. Fabius Maximus were consuls in 116, but such prosopographical arguments are very weak. There is no reason to think that Macer glorified the Fabii any more or less than any other annalist, and without other evidence one should not follow Soltau in automatically assigning passages of Fabian glorification in Livy or DH to Macer.

[57] H. Strasburger, *Concordia Ordinum* (Diss. Frankfurt a.M., 1931), 3=*Studien zur alten Geschichte* (Hildesheim, 1982), 11. For sensible discussion of Strasburger's thesis see Walt 188–90 and Cornell, cit. (n. 54), 24 (rightly noting that Strasburger's evidence precludes the view that Macer adopted an authorial tone as extreme as that of the Sallustian Macer).

[58] For the argument see Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 422–3, 640–7 (with speculation about use of a family *laudatio* of Fabius Rullianus); Peter 1. ccclviii; Ogilvie, *Comm.* 9.

'One of Licinius' political allies was L. (or Cn.) Sicinius . . . The Sicinii amply graced the pages of Macer's history.' Thus Ogilvie (*Comm.* 10), with references to Livy 2.32.2, 5.24.11, and his notes on those passages. The argument is in some respects attractive, but for the first tribunes of the plebs of 493 some sources had two Licinii, some a Sicinius and a Licinius, and Macer cannot have been responsible for all these inventions.[59]

That the portrait of the patrician Claudii found in Livy books 2–10 and the corresponding books of DH (where extant) has been the subject of systematic blackening and perversion in which virtually all Claudii are made diehard patrician reactionaries is not in doubt. We do not know which annalist or annalists was or were responsible. Mommsen and Soltau thought of Macer, and given his likely political views this guess is not unattractive (note the opposition between Ap. Claudius and Licinius Calvus at Liv. 5.20.4–10); but there are numerous other possibilities.[60]

On the question of Macer's style, T1 needs detailed elucidation, partly because its text is corrupt, and partly because Cicero's criticisms are of interest in their own right. In it Atticus, an interlocutor in the *De legibus*, places Macer among those writers who had progressed beyond the most primitive stage of stylistic composition. He certainly finishes with a reference to the style adopted by Macer in his speeches, by which he probably means the speeches in his history;[61] it is virtually certain that he refers to his *impudentia* in them, and probable that the corrupt *datio* hides *elatio*. In general, Mommsen's *multa sed inepta elatio, summa impudentia*, closer to the paradosis than Gutschmid's attempted improvement on it, is the most elegant restoration of the *crux*.[62] *Graecorum copia* picks up earlier references to Greek style and the need for a rhetorical training in the writing of history.[63] The translation of *librariolis* is uncertain,

[59] For this evidence see above; for criticism of Ogilvie's view, see Briscoe in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Livy* (London, 1971), 10.

[60] Mommsen, *Hist. Rome*[2] 1. 507–9; Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 421–2. For full discussions see Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 55–139; Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 665–9.

[61] Thus, rightly, e.g. Meyer, *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*[3] (Zurich, 1842), 380; Unger, *NJPhP* 143 (1891), 319; Walt 144; A. R. Dyck, *Cicero, de legibus* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2004), 79. Weichert, (*Commentatio de C. Licinio Calvo*, 7; *Poetarum Latinorum . . . reliquiae*, 96) and L. P. Kenter (*Cicero, de legibus: A Commentary on Book 1* (Amsterdam, 1972), 45–6) held that Cicero is making a general criticism of Macer's oratorical style, as he does in the *Brutus* (see above); but this does not fit the context.

[62] The attributive *inepta* obviates Bake's objection to *elatio*, that one would expect it to be a compliment (J. Bake, *Cicero, de legibus* (Leiden, 1842), 287). Halm's conjecture (*ap.* J. C. Orelli, J. G. Baiter, *M. Tulli Ciceronis opera . . . omnia* 4 (Zurich 1861), 857) also gives good sense, but his emendation of *datio* is less probable (one could vary it by retaining *impudentiam*). The same may be said of Sigonius' conjecture. In the other conjectures there is little merit: those of A. W. Zumpt, R. Klotz (*M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia* 4.2 (Leipzig, 1855), 344), and J. Vahlen (*M. Tullii Ciceronis de legibus libri* (Berlin 1871), 8; (2nd edn., Berlin, 1883), 9–10), this last based on a reading in some *recentiores*, are all extremely awkward (esp. those that involve the unwanted *adeo*). Likewise, the introduction of any of *clamator*, *epistulis relatis* (that is, the letters incorporated in historiography, such as found at Quadrigarius 24 F41), or *perturbationes* (='heftige affecte'), as in the conjectures of, respectively, Bake (cit.), Nipperdey (*Philologus* 6 (1854), 406=*Opuscula*, 137), and T. Plüss (*NJPhP* 99 (1869), 568 n. 1), is improbable. G. de Plinval (*Cicéron, Traité des lois* (Paris, 1959), 4) ingeniously makes the vexed sentence refer to Sisenna (the historian mentioned in the next sentence of Cicero), but his conjecture bears little resemblance to the paradosis. Reifferscheid (*RhM* 17 (1862), 278) posited his *lacuna* so that what comes after it could refer to Valerius Antias, otherwise ignored by Cicero; the conjecture cannot be refuted, but there is no need to introduce a reference to Antias here.

[63] For this interpretation of *copia* see e.g. J. Bake, *Cicero, de legibus* (Leiden, 1842) 286; Peter *HRR* 1[1] (1870), cccxxxxi; Walt, 145; A. Dyck, *Cicero, de legibus* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2004), 80. Bake and Peter were refuting the view that it refers to collections of Greek books.

but, as Orelli observed,[64] there is more point in interpreting it as a diminutive of *librarium* ('a bookcase') than *librarius* ('a scribe'): one would not expect to learn from scribes, but 'little Latin book-cases' is perhaps a reference to Latin rhetoricians (see also *TLL* 7.2.1346.78–83). If so, then Cicero comes close to repeating here the formulation of *de orat.* 3.93–4, where 'Crassus' explains that as censor he closed down the rhetorical schools at Rome because, in contrast to Greek rhetoricians, they provided no philosophical basis for instruction and encouraged *impudentia* (the word is used twice) in speech. It seems likely, therefore, that through Atticus Cicero criticized Macer for his general loquacity and for his ineptitude and impudence in his speeches. Though biased, no Roman was a more competent judge of these matters than Cicero, and he may well have been right; but the surviving evidence allows neither confirmation nor refutation.

That Macer included speeches in his history is confirmed by F7, F8, and perhaps F5.[65] This is scarcely surprising: he himself was an orator; his work was on a large scale (see above); and almost all Greek and Roman historians who wrote on such a scale included speeches. Virtually nothing else can be said about Macer's style. Eccentric or unusual expressions are found in virtually all the fragments that quote his words (see commentary on F5, 6, 7, 8, 29), but the grammarians chose to cite eccentricities, and there is no evidence that Macer's vocabulary and grammar was any more unusual than that of e.g. Livy. Bardon claimed that he affected archaism, but Lebek rightly argues that the extant fragments do not allow this to be established (only *quietes* in F5, on the most probable interpretation, is an archaism).[66]

A final assessment of Macer is not easy: Walt inclined to emphasize the diligent antiquarian, Mommsen, who had an irrational dislike of Macer, the tendentious inventions. Since most of the fragments that reveal something of his historical techniques come from passages in which Livy and DH disagreed with him, the accidents of his survival do not show him at his best. Nevertheless, the commentary will show that original information provided by Macer is almost always unreliable.

(SPO)

[64] J. C. Orelli, *M. Tulli Ciceronis opera . . . omnia* 4.1 (Zurich, 1838), 499.

[65] See Krause 235; Peter 1. ccclv.

[66] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 259; Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 288. On Macer's style see further General Introduction, I. 34.

28

C. Piso

Principal discussions: Peter 1[2]. cccIxxx; F. Münzer, 'C. Calpurnius (64) Piso', *RE* 3 (1897), 1377; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 196, 327.

INTRODUCTION

The historian C. Piso is known only from a single quotation in Plutarch dealing with the death of Marius in 86 BC (F1). His identity is a matter for conjecture. Cicero's son-in-law, C. Piso, who died in 58 BC, is praised in the *Brutus* (272) as a serious writer, but if he had published a history we should surely know about it. The Pisones were a family with a strong tradition of intellectual interests (thus Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 97, though she does not discuss our historian), and there are other possible candidates, perhaps most obviously C. Calpurnius Piso, the consul of 67, favoured by Peter and Münzer, who suggest that he may have continued the annals of his famous namesake (possibly a direct ancestor: cf. Syme, *JRS* 50 (1960), 14). He was no doubt the C. Piso whose oratorical style is described by Cicero in T1. The suggestion of G. Delvaux (*Latomus* 50 (1991) 88–92), that Plutarch's text should be emended to read Oppius, is hardly compelling. The grounds for questioning the transmitted reading are footling (such as the manifestly false claim that the Calpurnii Pisones shunned the *praenomen* Gaius), and the positive arguments for bringing in Oppius are too general to deserve serious consideration. See further on Oppius 40 F6.

(CJS)

29

M'. Otacilius Pitholaus

Principal discussions: Peter 1[2]. cclxxxiii–cclxxxiv; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 328–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 272; R. G. Lewis, 'Pompeius' freedman biographer: Suetonius, *de gramm. et rhet.* 27 (3)', *CR* 16 (1966), 271–3; S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969), 14, 118–19; S. Treggiari, 'Pompeius' freedman biographer again', *CR* 19 (1969), 264–6; Rawson, *Intellectual Life* (1985), 78–9, 91, 104; R. A. Kaster, *Studies on the Text of Suetonius*' 'de Grammaticis et Rhetoribus' (Atlanta, Ga., 1992), 120–4; Kaster, *Suetonius, gramm.* (1995), 297–9.

INTRODUCTION

The name of this individual is preserved in corrupt form in at least three of the available testimonia (T1, 3–4), and it is not entirely clear that they are all, in fact, referring to the same person.[1] But Pontano's suggested restoration of the name Otacilius in both Suetonius (T1) and Macrobius (T4) is attractive in place of the otherwise unattested Voltacilius, Votacilius, or Oltacilius, especially if the *praenomen* is emended to Manius, from the Lucius of T1 and the Marcus of T4.[2] If this identification is accepted, the *cognomen* Pitholaus (T2, T4), a plausible name for a freedman rhetor, is to be preferred to the meaningless Pilutus of T1. Jerome's Vultacilius Plotus (T3) can be accounted for if his text of Suetonius was already corrupted,[3] and 'Plotus' may be influenced by the fact that L. Plotius Gallus is the subject of Suetonius' preceding chapter (*gramm.* 26). Jerome's carelessness is in any case evident in the fact that he makes him a freedman of Pompey, rather than of one of the Otacilii who were clients of the Pompeii.[4]

If we are right to see the same person in T2 and T4 as in T1 and T3, he wrote scurrilous verses against Caesar and was still alive to make a caustic remark about Caninius Rebilus' consulship in 45 BC. Although Jerome's entry occurs under 81 BC, which is a bit late for the opening of his school if the young Pompey was one of its

[1] Treggiari (*Roman Freedmen* (1969), 118–19 n. 8; *CR* 16 (1969), 264–6) prefers to separate the grammarian of T1 from the satirist of T2 and T4; she is followed by T. P. Wiseman, *History* 66 (1981), 380 n. 24.

[2] Manius was one of those rare *praenomina* favoured by only a small number of families (as Appius by the Claudii, or Servius by the Sulpicii). The Otacilii were one of those (others included the Acilii and Curii) who regularly used Manius. Lewis (*CR* 16 (1966), 272) showed that the abbreviation M'. could easily be misread as LV or MV, which thus explains the corruption of both the *praenomen* from M'. to L. or M., and of the *nomen* from Otacilius to Voltacilius. See the full discussion of Kaster, *Studies on the Text* (1992), 120–4.

[3] Lewis, *CR* 16 (1966), 272; Kaster, *Studies on the Text* (1992), 124.

[4] They include M'. Otacilius M'.f., a member of Pompeius Strabo's *consilium* at Asculum in 89 (*ILS* 8888), and Otacilius Crassus, probably his son, who held Lissus for Pompey in 48 (Caes. *BCiv.* 3.28–9).

pupils, Lewis suggested (*CR* 16 (1966), 273) that Pompey might have attended as a mature student, on the strength of Suetonius' comment (*gramm.* 25.3) that he returned to the study of declamation just before the civil war in order to respond to C. Curio.

Suetonius says (following Cornelius Nepos) that Pitholaus was the first freedman to write history, and that his output included accounts of the achievements of his patrons the Pompeii, father and son. Whether these were incorporated in one work or in two separate ones is not clear, but the result amounted to several books. The dates of composition and publication remain unknown, as does the character of the work(s), although we may presume that he favoured Pompey over Caesar, whom he was not afraid to criticize even when he was dictator. He appears to have established a precedent for other memoirs of great men by their freedmen and supporters, such as Tiro's biography of Cicero (46), and perhaps the works of Licinius Apollonius (35), Munatius Rufus (37), Volumnius (47), Julius Marathus (65), and others of the same type.

(CJS)

30

L. Lucceius

Principal discussions: Peter 2. xxx–xxxi; Münzer, 'L. Lucceius (6)', *RE* 13 (1927),1554–9; V. Paladini, 'Sul pensiero storiografico di Cicerone', *Latomus* 6 (1947), 329–44; W. C. McDermott, 'De Lucceiis', *Hermes* 97 (1969), 233–46.

INTRODUCTION

Life

There were two L. Lucceii active in the mid-first century BC. Our MSS identify Cicero's correspondent in *fam.* 5.12–15 as son of Quintus, whilst Cic. *Att.* 5.21.13 records a 'L. Lucceius son of Marcus'. Asconius (*tog. cand.* 70St=91C) identifies the L. Lucceius who prosecuted Catiline in 64 with the Lucceius who stood for the consulship of 59 (Cic. *Att.* 1.14.7; 17.11; etc.); despite McDermott (*Hermes* 97 (1969), 233–46), there is no reason to doubt Asconius' testimony. This Lucceius is presumably the putative high-minded urban praetor of 67,[1] and Asconius' description of him as 'well-equipped and learned' (*paratus eruditusque*) fits both Cicero's characterisation of the man who entertained Dio of Alexandria in 57 (Cic. *Cael.* 51–5, esp.54) and the historian.[2]

Thus we may plausibly identify the historian with the prosecutor of Catiline (a potential rival for the consulship) and the (equally unsuccessful) candidate for the consulship of 59. This would justify to some degree Cicero's reference to his high distinction and description of him as having shown his colours 'in the most significant and important public issues' (*fam.* 5.12.7), implying that he possessed the political experience commonly desiderated in a historian. He may also be the L. Lucceius who was a friend of Pompey already by 59 and one of his close advisors in the civil war.[3] If so, he had evidently been pardoned by Caesar by 46 BC though by no means fully reconciled to the new political order (Cic. *fam.* 5.13.3–4). Nothing certain is known of his further fate.[4]

[1] Dio 36.41.1–2 with Brennan, *Praetorship* 2. 455; 825 nn. 130–1. For the presumed corruption in Dio's text cf. Cic. *Att.* 15.11.1 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc.; Ascon. *tog. cand.* 70St=91C.

[2] See below. That Cicero describes the historian as *paratus* in *fam.* 5.13.1 is, however, less significant since *paratus* there refers to Lucceius' moral capacity to face (mis)fortune. More pertinent is the argument that Cicero explicitly identifies the son of Marcus as such in *Att.* 5.21.13 because elsewhere 'Lucceius' for him means the son of Quintus unless his correspondent would already know otherwise (cf. Münzer, *RE* 13. 1554).

[3] Cic. *fam.* 13.41–2 (61/60 BC) with Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero. ad fam.* 1. 353; Cic. *Att.* 9.1.3; 11.3; Caes. *BCiv.* 3.18.3 (49–48 BC).

[4] For conjectures cf. Münzer, *RE* 13. 1558; Hinard, *Proscriptions*, 488–90. For further discussion and bibliography on Lucceius and his family background see E. Deniaux, *Clientèles et pouvoir à l'époque de Cicéron* (Rome, 1993), 516–19.

Work

Lucceius was cultivated (Cic. *fam.* 5.13.1; 3; cf. *Cael.* 54; Ascon. *tog. cand.* 70St=91C (above); G. O. Hutchinson, *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study* (Oxford, 1998), 63; J. Hall, *CPh* 93 (1998), 315–16), but, although he evidently published the speeches from his prosecution of Catiline (Ascon. *tog. cand.* 71St=92C), he was clearly not a first-rank orator or (so far as we know) of proven military experience. It was presumably after his failure to secure the consulship that, like Sallust later, he sought an alternative route to fame in the writing of history. All our information about his work derives from the famous letter (*fam.* 5.12)[5] in which Cicero asks him to write a monograph on his changing fortunes from his consulship through to his return from exile, a request which, despite Cicero's further efforts (*Att.* 4.6.4; 9.2; 11.2), Lucceius apparently failed to fulfil. The history that Lucceius did produce evidently began with the Italian (i.e. Social) War of 91–88, in which he could himself have served, thus starting where he could call on his own experience. His (as yet uncompleted) work had continued with the civil war that culminated in Sulla's triumph in 81 (cf. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero, ad fam.* 1. 319; R. Brown, *SLLRH* 11 (2003), 102–6) and, he had assured Cicero, would extend to the orator's own day (*fam.* 5.12.9). Military and political conflict within Italy was clearly a central theme and presumably would have provided the context for Lucceius' narrative of events in the 70s and thereafter if he ever completed it: the Sullan era still played a significant role in contemporary political ideology and posturing (see e.g. B. A. Marshall, *Historia* 33 (1984), 199–219), and Lucceius' prosecution of Catiline was apparently based on his role in the Sullan proscriptions (Ascon. *tog. cand.* 70St=91C with Suet. *Iul.* 11).

Cicero clearly implies that his historical work was organized chronologically and included both domestic and foreign affairs on a considerable scale and with a wealth of detail.[6] It is generally assumed that it was written in Latin, but as Shackleton Bailey points out (*Cicero, ad fam.* 1. 318), Lucceius could equally well have written in Greek (though his omission from 'Atticus'' review of published Latin historiography in *leg.* 1.6–7 (=GT2) does not necessarily show that[7]). His preface contained an unmistakably Greek touch (F1 with commentary), and the historiographical models and examples Cicero cites in his letter to him are exclusively Greek. Perhaps then Lucceius, rather than emulate Sisenna in Latin, sought to rival and outdo Lucullus' history of the Social War in Greek.

That Lucceius could take unusual pains with style is shown by his avoidance of elision in his surviving letter to Cicero (*fam.* 5.14 with C. Ehrhardt, *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 152–3). As Shackleton Bailey remarks (*Mnemosyne* 40 (1987), 420), that specific feature is unlikely to have characterized his writing in general, but Cicero's

[5] For the date of this letter see L. R. Taylor, *CPh* 44 (1949), 217–21.

[6] See T1–3; Cic. *fam.* 5.12.9 (promised detailed treatment of Cicero's own times).

[7] Cf. above, l. 57, 295. It is unlikely that Cicero's allusion (*leg.* 1.7=GT2) to historians who have not yet published, and whose works cannot therefore be evaluated, refers to Lucceius (as, tentatively, A. R. Dyck, *Cicero, de legibus* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2003), ad loc.): Cicero evidently knew enough of his work in 55 to form a judgement of its quality.

own request to Lucceius implies that in his eyes his work demonstrated the literary skill and command with which Cicero credits him (*fam.* 5.12.3; 6–7), since that would be needed to realize the kind of monograph Cicero envisages. His reference to the polish Lucceius will apply to his work (*fam.* 5.12.10), and emphasis on the charm (*suauissime*) of his preface (F1), also suggest Lucceius' concern with style, as well perhaps as Cicero's appreciation of the elegant deployment of Prodicus' paradigmatic myth (cf. Cic. *part. orat.* 22), itself suggestively reworked later to programmatic purposes by Ovid (*am.* 3.1; M. Wyke in A. M. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text* (London, 1989), 124–31; cf. also Lucian *somnium* 6–16). Such 'charm' might also imply a smooth elegance of style (Cic. *part. orat.* 21), conceivably with Xenophon himself as a model (cf. Catulus 19 T1; Cic. *orat.* 62): that might in turn reinforce Lucceius' claims to objectivity (for Xenophon as an exemplar of impartiality see Lucian *quomodo hist. conscr. sit* 39; cf. Diod. 1.37.4) and explain why Cicero offers another type of Xenophontic work, the *Agesilaus*, as a model for the proposed monograph (*fam.* 5.12.7; cf. also Paladini, *Latomus* 6 (1947), 335–6).

(AD)

31

Q. Hortensius Hortalus

Editions: Peter 2. xxviiii–xxx, 9.

Principal discussions: E. Wölfflin, 'Die Annalen des Hortensius', *Hermes* 27 (1892), 652–4; F. Münzer, 'Hortensius und Cicero bei historischen Studien', *Hermes* 49 (1914), 196–213; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 387; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 249–50; Courtney, *FLP* (1993), 230–1.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Velleius (T2) must refer to Q. Hortensius Hortalus (114–50 BC),[1] who himself served in the Social War (Cic. *Brut.* 304). Already by the late 80s he had established himself as Rome's leading orator and reached the consulship in 69. By this time Cicero had matched, if not surpassed, his standing as an orator, but he remained an influential and well-connected optimate and prestigious forensic performer through to his death. His wayward elder son, Q. Hortensius (quaest. 50?; pr. 45?),[2] was perhaps born *c.*80 BC; he was eventually executed by the triumvirs after Philippi.

Work

Apart from speeches and a work on oratorical commonplaces, Hortensius may have published light verses.[3] Despite the defects in the text, Catullus 95 (T1) clearly implies that a Hortensius in the late 60s or early 50s was engaged in rapid large-scale versification,[4] and the apparent parallel with Volusius' annals (clearly a historical epic) has suggested that Catullus refers to the annals of Hortensius attested by Velleius. Münzer further supports this by reference to the story of the wager involving Sisenna, Hortensius, and Lucullus in Plut. *Luc.* 1.7–8 (Lucullus 23 T4, Sisenna 26

[1] Cf. Vell. 2.36.2; 48.6; Von der Mühl, *RE* 8. 2470–81 (n. 13); cf. further below (on *dilucide*). Velleius introduces Hortensius' son as such in 2.71.2.

[2] Münzer, *RE* 8. 2468–9 (n. 8).

[3] Light verses: Ovid *trist.* 2.441–2; Pliny *epist.* 5.3.5; Gell. 19.9.7; cf. the citation in Varro *ling.* 8.14 (cf. 10.78; Quint. *inst.* 8.3.35). T. P. Wiseman (*Cinna the Poet* (Leicester, 1974), 190 n.65) and Rawson (*Roman Culture*, 369–71) attribute this poetry to the son, as does D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches* (2nd edn., Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992), 55–6), but both Varro and Quintilian in particular specify simply 'Hortensius', with the obvious implication that the more famous father is intended (cf. perhaps Sen. *de ira* 3.37.5). Ovid's reference to Hortensius as a great name that none would hesitate to follow further supports this (1. 399).

[4] G. Lieberg, *Prometheus* 26 (2000), 137–9. Similar language and considerations might be used of narrative prose (see esp. Nepos *Epam.* 4.6), but despite Catullus' own praise of Nepos for his concision in 1.5–6, Catullus must refer to poetic composition here.

T16) by which Lucullus drew a lot to determine whether he should write of the Social War in Greek or Latin, and in verse or prose. He supposes that Sisenna and Hortensius also drew lots, and that since Lucullus and Sisenna wrote in Greek and Latin prose respectively, Hortensius must have employed a verse form.[5] However, Plutarch says nothing of Hortensius or Sisenna drawing lots on this occasion, and a wager set in Hortensius' youth would be hard to reconcile with Catullus' implied dating of Hortensius' efforts.

Conversely, some emend 'Hortensius' in Catullus' text, objecting to the triple contrast of Hortensius, Volusius, and Antimachus with Cinna and adducing the friendly representation of '(H)ortalus' as a devotee of Callimachus in Catullus 65.[6] Neither objection is compelling: the first is entirely subjective (and not shared by most commentators: cf. e.g. G. Lieberg, *Prometheus* 26 (2000), 137–8); the second can be avoided by assuming that Catullus' relationship with Hortensius changed (so Kroll on 95.3), supposing that the Hortalus of Catullus 65 is Hortensius' son,[7] or even (less plausibly) reinterpreting Catullus 65 as a critique of Hortensius (V. Buchheit *GB* 4 (1975), 39–50; cf. G. Laursen, *C&M* 40 (1989), 161–9). The proposed emendations (see the *apparatus criticus*) are also unsatisfactory[8] and the possibility that Hortensius wrote a (Latin) historical epic (in which the deeds of allies would find a natural place) remains open.

None of this is certain, however. Catullus 95 might, for example, refer to something other than a historical epic by Hortensius, or even perhaps to otherwise unattested prolix efforts of the younger Hortensius, whereas the father, who may well have shared Catullus' cultural tastes (cf. Gell. 1.5.3; *contra* Buchheit, *GB* 4 (1975), 41–3), was the dedicatee of Catullus 65. In that case T1 becomes irrelevant and we are left with Velleius, who should be citing a prose historian here (poetry providing no guarantee of truth).[9] Velleius' adverb *dilucide* ('clearly') reinforces this expectation. It and the corresponding adjective are overwhelmingly terms of rhetorical theory, denoting the clarity desiderated in oratory, especially in the narration of the events concerned in the case (*narratio*), the part of a forensic speech to which historical prose narrative

[5] Münzer, *Hermes* 49 (1914), 199–201; cf. Wölfflin, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 652–4; Lieberg, *Prometheus* 26 (2000), 141; *contra*, Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1. 249; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 368. Münzer's suggestion would gain force if the story itself is a later fiction, designed to explain how three contemporaries came to write of the same recent events in different formats. Sen. *contr.* 1 praef.19 (cf. Quint. *inst.* 11.2.24) may refer to another wager with Sisenna in which Hortensius demonstrated his exceptional powers of memory (Cic. *Brut.* 301). Cf. I. 307–8.

[6] See recently J. B. Solodow *CPh* 82 (1987), 141–5; Courtney, *FLP* 230–1; A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60* BC–AD 20 (Oxford, 2007), 156.

[7] So Syme, *RR* 63 n. 1; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches* (2nd edn., Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992), 55–6; Hollis, l.c.

[8] They presuppose that the reference is to Volusius, assume that he came from (H)atria, and introduce an appropriate toponym. But Catullus nowhere else introduces a friend or foe by toponym alone (contrast 12.1; 59.1), the combination of the obscure toponym in the first quatrain with the proper name in the second is hardly persuasive, and, despite H. A. J. Munro's arguments to the contrary (*Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus* (Cambridge, 1878), 213), Atria is not on or near the (branch of the) Po di Primaro to which Catullus 'Padua' refers (cf. Pol. 2.16.11; Pliny *nat.* 3.119–20 with Philipp, *RE* 18.2. 2202–3 and map at 2183–4).

[9] So e.g. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1. 249–50; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 368.

could most obviously be assimilated,[10] despite their different stylistic requirements (Cic. *orat.* 124; Pliny *epist.* 5.8.9–10).[11] Its use here (unique in Velleius) presumably compliments Hortensius on bringing to his history the clarity demonstrated in his oratory (thus confirming the identity of orator and author) but also attributes to the annals a quality more obviously desiderated in prose historiography than historical epic.[12]

What is clear, however, is that, whatever format he used,[13] Hortensius' work gave particular credit to an ally who remained loyal to, and raised local forces for, Rome despite the defection of his people, and who was rewarded by Rome accordingly,[14] an insight into a potentially important dimension to the Social War that our surviving narrative sources ignore except where specific towns offered resistance to the rebels. Since the Hirpini clearly joined the revolt relatively early (App. *b.c.* 1.39.175), Minatus must have raised his force in 90[15] and may already have served alongside T. Didius in that year,[16] but Velleius evidently recalls only his successes in 89. The capture of Herculaneum must belong before Didius' death on 11 June (Ovid *fast.* 6.567–8); that will have resulted in the transference of Minatus' forces to Sulla and the ensuing operations against Pompeii and (amongst the Hirpini) Compsa.[17] Hortensius himself may have served under Sulla and witnessed some of those operations at first hand.[18]

(AD)

[10] See esp. Lucian *quomodo hist. conscr. sit* 55; Victorinus, *Rhet. Min.* pp.201–8; Woodman, *Rhetoric*, 84–7; important observations and qualifications in R. Nicolai, *La storiografia nell'educazione antica* (Pisa, 1992), 124–39.

[11] So e.g. *rhet. Her.* 1.15; 2.3; Cic. *part. orat.* 31–2; cf. ibid. 19; Quint. *inst.* 4.2.31: see *TLL* 5.1186.55–75 and 1187.4–40. The term had already been used in the context of prose historical biography in Nepos *Epam.* 1.1.

[12] See e.g. Pol. 4.28.2–4; 5.31.4–7 (cf. 3.32.2); Lucian *quomodo hist. conscr. sit* 43–4, 55, 57, 58; G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim, 1956), 61–2; 119–27. Velleius cites only two historical sources in his work (Cato (1.7.3=Cato 5 F52) and Hortensius), both for Campanian material in which he had a personal interest, and where he probably therefore used the works concerned at first hand (cf. 1. 137, and comm. on Cato 5 F52).

[13] If in prose, his history may have been in Greek (for his claims to Greek culture cf. Gell. 1.5.3). Its scope is beyond recovery (the citations of Hortensius as an authority in Cic. *Att.* 12.5b; 13.30.2; 32.3; 33.3 clearly derive from oral information (Peter 2. xxx; Münzer, *Hermes* 49 (1914), 204–13)).

[14] For Minatus Magius, his forebears, and descendants see Münzer, *Hermes* 49 (1914), esp. 198 nn. 1–2; *RE* 14. 438–42 (esp. nos. 5, 6, 8, 10 (Münzer); 14 (Fluss); 18 (Stein); 19 (Münzer)); G. V. Sumner, *HSCPh* 74 (1970), 257–61. For Decius Magius see Livy 23.7.4–10.13; Cic. *Pis.* 24; Sil. Ital. 11.157–258, 377–84; 13.280–1; cf. also Quadrigarius 24 F55 comm. The family also prospered locally after Sulla's victory (cf. *ILLRP* 523), and local rivalries no doubt played a significant role in Minatus' actions.

[15] If Vell.2.16.3 correctly implies that Minatus was given citizenship by a specific legislative enactment (Sumner, *HSCPh* 74 (1970), 260), it may have preceded the *lex Iulia* of late 90 (P. A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1988), 133) rather than followed it, as Sumner assumes.

[16] It is obviously likely that he and/or his sons had earlier seen service with Roman commanders, conceivably with Didius himself.

[17] Vossius' correction of *Cosam* (on the Etruscan coast) to *Compsam* is certain.

[18] Münzer, *Hermes* 49 (1914), 204; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 371–2. On Barabino's suggestion that Sisenna 26 F107 refers to the force raised by Minatus see commentary ad loc. Sisenna must, however, have recorded the specific successes with which Minatus is credited here (cf. comm. on Sisenna 26 F88–9). On Keaveney's suggestion (*CPh* 76 (1981), 295–6) that Sulla 22 F3 derives from a speech by Minatus see comm. ad loc.

32

Lutatius

Editions: Peter 1^2. cclxii–cclxix, 191–4; G. Funaioli, *GRF* (1907), 122–3; Chassignet 3. xvi–xxii, 6–12.

Principal discussions: Leo, *GRL* (1913), 343–4; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 206–7; Bardon, 'Q. Lutatius Catulus et son cercle litteraire', *LEC* 18 (1950), 145–64 (= *Lit. inconnue* 1 (1952), 115–32); A. La Penna, 'Sulla *communis historia* di Lutazio', in *Studi su Varrone, sulla retorica, storiografia e poesia latina*, Festschr. B. Riposati (Rieti, 1979), 229–40; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 136; Kaster, *Suetonius, gramm.* (1995), 182–3; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 451, 544; J. M. Candau, 'Republican Rome' in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 121–59, at 151–3.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The identity of this author is uncertain. Twelve fragments, predominantly dealing with early history, are ascribed to a Lutatius, often identified with Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102 BC), who appears elsewhere in this edition as the author of a historical memoir (above, no. 19). But this suggested identification is problematic, and in our view cannot be sustained. Most of the 'Lutatius' fragments relate to the origins of Rome. Two of them are explicitly assigned to a work entitled *Communis historia* (F1) or *Communes historiae* (F2), and it is likely that the remaining ten (F3–12) also belong to this work. Certainly none of them could plausibly be assigned to Q. Lutatius Catulus' memoir on his consulship and achievements.

None of the citing authorities provides any indication that the Lutatius who wrote the *Communis historia*[1] was the Lutatius Catulus who wrote about his own deeds in 102–101 BC. It is true that the latter had wide intellectual interests and wrote a number of published works, and that no other Lutatius is known to have written history; for these reasons most scholars, including Peter and Chassignet, have ascribed the *Communis historia* to him.[2] This would be unproblematic were it not for the fact that the consul of 102 is always referred to as Catulus or Lutatius Catulus, while the author of the *Communis historia* is never called anything except simply Lutatius. This striking discrepancy creates a strong prima facie case for supposing that we are dealing with two different authors. A second argument is that F8, which

[1] For convenience we shall refer to the work in the singular, although the plural form *Communes historiae* is equally possible. For discussion of this issue, without resolving it, see La Penna, *Festschr. Riposati* (1979), 233.

[2] So too Funaioli, *GRF* 122; Münzer, *RE* 13. 2081–3; La Penna, *Festschr. Riposati* (1979), 233–6; Richard, *OGR* 136; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1. 451.

claims that Aeneas was a traitor who betrayed Troy to the Greeks, is unlikely to have been written by Catulus, who was related by marriage to Aeneas' descendants, the Julii Caesares (see also comm. ad loc.). We conclude that Lutatius, the author of the *Communis historia*, is unlikely to have been Q. Lutatius Catulus.

The only other thing we can say for certain about Lutatius is that he was writing under the republic, because his work is quoted by Varro in the *De lingua Latina* (F11), which was published before Cicero's death in 43 BC. Lutatius is a rare name, but as it happens we do know of another Lutatius who was active in the intellectual life of Rome at precisely this time. This was Q. Catulus' freedman, the grammarian Lutatius Daphnis, who was bought as a slave for 700,000 sesterces and shortly afterwards freed.[3] The idea that the *Communis historia* was the work of Lutatius Daphnis is perfectly tenable[4] and has been advocated by a number of scholars;[5] it would certainly explain the fact that the author is named simply 'Lutatius'. The alternative would be to accept that Lutatius is an otherwise completely unknown writer.

Work

The import of the title has been much discussed. *Communis historia* appears to be a direct translation of the Greek κοινὴ ἱστορία, meaning general or 'universal' history, as in Diod. 1.1.1, where the phrase clearly refers to a history of the world. It is conceivable that a history of the world is what Lutatius attempted,[6] and that the preserved fragments, which concern the early history of Rome and Italy, give a misleading impression of what the work was really like. But its scope was probably less ambitious than a complete world history. 'General histories' (κοιναὶ ἱστορίαι) dealt with 'general events' (κοιναὶ πράξεις), which are contrasted with the affairs of a single state (thus Diod. 1.3.2); similarly Polybius (8.2(4).11) contrasts general history (κοινὴ ἱστορία) with that of particular areas or regions (ἱστορία κατὰ μέρος). An example was the work of Timaeus (DH 1.6.1), which covered the Greek cities of Italy and Sicily, and other states in the western Mediterranean, including Rome and

[3] Suet. *gramm.* 3 (=T2). Suetonius adds the quip of C. Melissus, who called Daphnis *Πανὸς ἀγαπήμα* ('Pan's darling'), implying that his high price was not entirely a reflection of his intellectual ability (L. Holford Strevens, *LCM* 6 (1981), 181–2; Kaster, *Comm.* ad loc.). Pliny (*nat.* 7.128=T1) says that the price, still a record in his day, was offered to Attius of Pisaurum (=the poet Accius?) by M. Aemilius Scaurus. This must either be a mistake by Pliny, who confused Scaurus with Catulus, or refer to a more complicated set of transactions. Fraccaro (*Opuscula*, 2. 147) argued that Scaurus bought Daphnis from Attius, that Catulus acquired him after Scaurus' death in 88 at the original purchase price, and that he was then freed in Catulus' will after the latter's suicide in 87 (cf. Münzer, *RE* 13. 2095; Kaster, *Comm.* 82, dating the transactions somewhat earlier). This ingenious solution fits the evidence, but that does not necessarily make it credible.

[4] It is not contradicted by the statement of Cornelius Nepos that the first freedman to write history was L. Otacilius Pitholaus (Suet. *gramm. et rhet.* 17 (=Otacilius Pitholaus 29 T1)). Otacilius was probably an older contemporary of Lutatius Daphnis, and his biography of Pompey's father may have been written in the years after the latter's death (87 BC).

[5] First suggested by O. Jahn in his 1843 edition of Persius (cxliii n. 2), and taken up by Peter, *NJPhP* 115 (1877), 751 (and in *HRF* 125–7, but in 1914 he reverted to the position of *HRR*[1], where the fragments of the *Communis historia* were assigned to Catulus); also E. Norden, *GGA* 6 (1894), 492; Wissowa, *RuK*[2] 67; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 120–1.

[6] Bardon (*Litt. inconnue*, 1. 122, followed by Richard, *OGR* 136 and Chassignet 3. xxii) wrongly supposed that this was Peter's view.

Carthage, but was not a universal history in the strict sense. Dionysius refers to 'general history' when he wants to compare Roman customs with Greek (5.17.3), or when he seeks to synchronize events from different traditions, as in his discussion of the dates of Numa and Pythagoras: from general histories we learn that Pythagoras lived four generations later than Numa (2.59.1).[7]

Lutatius' title need mean no more than that his work was not confined to Rome (which is confirmed by F6), and/or that it was set in a universal chronological framework (see F9 with comm.). The fragments suggest a work concerned with the legendary origins of Rome and other Italian cities and peoples, and tracing the adventures of Aeneas (and perhaps of other heroes), his companions, and their descendants. It was perhaps also, as Bardon suggested, the first attempt to construct a chronological concordance of the type later produced by Atticus and Cornelius Nepos (see nos. 33 and 45).[8] Either or both of these features would more than justify the title *Communis historia*. It is of course possible that Lutatius' work extended over a wider geographical and a longer chronological span; as ever the preserved fragments are a sample biased by the interests and concerns of the citing authorities. The fragments cited with book numbers (F1, 3–6) indicate that the work contained at least four books, but the structure is almost completely beyond recovery. The fact that book 3 was still dealing with Aeneas (F4) and the Alban kings (F5), however, strongly suggests a work concerned predominantly with legendary events.

(CJS)

[7] On the meaning of *κοινὴ ἱστορία* and *communis historia* see La Penna, *Festschr. Riposati* (1979), 229–33, whom we have followed here, against the views of Peter (cclxvii), that *communes historiae* are 'common' (i.e. commonly accepted) stories, and Wissowa (*RuK*[2] 67) and others (Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 122; Chassignet 3. xvii), that Lutatius wrote about the things Romans and Greeks shared in common, in religion, customs, etc.

[8] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 122. On the other hand, we know that Nepos' *Chronica* was published before 54 BC (see introduction to Nepos, 1. 398, so Lutatius' work could have been later.

33

T. Pomponius Atticus

Editions: Peter 2. xx–xxviiii, 6–8; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 189 (Greek memoir); Beck–Walter 2. 358–67 (*Annalis*); Y. Benferhat, *BNJ* 189.

Principal discussions: C. Cichorius, *De fastis consularibus antiquissimis*, *LSKPh* 9 (1886), esp. 245–57; F. Münzer, 'Atticus als Geschichtschreiber,' *Hermes* 40 (1905), 50–100; A .M. Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus* (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1920), 23–51; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 329–32; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 267–8; R. Feger, 'T. Pomponius (102) Atticus', *RE* Suppl. 8 (1956), 503–26; G. Puccioni, *La fortuna medievale della Origo gentis Romanae* (Florence, 1958), 137–54; H. J. Bäumerich, *Über die Bedeutung der Genealogie in der römischen Literatur* (diss. Cologne, 1964), esp. 63–72; G. D'Anna, 'Alcune osservazioni sulle fonti di Gellio, *N.A.* XVII, 21 e sulla cronologia geronimiana dei poeti latini arcaici', *ArchClass* 25–6 (1973–4), 166–237; id. 'Alcune considerazioni sulla fortuna del "Liber Annalis" di Attico: Attico fonte di Gellio?' *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 331–47; O. Perlwitz, *Titus Pomponius Atticus* (Stuttgart, 1992); A. Marshall, 'Atticus and the genealogies', *Latomus* 52 (1993), 307–17; Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker* (1993), esp. 162–78; M. Buckley, 'Atticus, man of letters, revisited', in K. Sidwell (ed.), *Pleiades Setting: Essays for Pat Cronin on his 65th Birthday* (Cork, 2002), 14–32; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar* (2007), 25–8.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Titus Pomponius, born in late 110 BC into an old-established equestrian family, acquired his additional name Atticus as a result of twenty years' residence in Athens from *c.*86/5 to 65/4 and the mastery of Greek that this entailed (Cic. *fin.* 5.4; cf. *Att.* 1.19.10; Nepos *Att.* 4.1). His contacts with Greece continued thereafter, not least through the estate at Buthrotum in Epirus which he purchased in 68 BC. However, particularly after his testamentary adoption by his maternal uncle Q. Caecilius in 58, his marriage to Pilia in 56, and the subsequent birth of his daughter Caecilia, he spent increasing amounts of time at Rome. In 63 he had been in the vanguard of the *equites* who guarded the senate during the debate on the fate of the Catilinarian conspirators (Cic. *Att.* 2.1.7). Thereafter, however, he studiously avoided overt political commitment, although he enjoyed no little influence through his wide range of friendships within the political elite and his assistance was no doubt solicited by many besides Cicero. At the outbreak of civil war in 49 he remained in Rome and secured the favour of Caesar. Caesar's assassination he welcomed with enthusiasm, but though his close contacts with Brutus continued at least for the immediate future, he soon retreated

[1] For full documentation see esp. Drumann–Groebe, *GR*[2] 5. 9–91; Byrne, *Atticus* (1920); Feger, *RE* Suppl. 8. 503–26; Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 1. 3–59; Perlwitz, *Atticus* (1992).

into a posture of political neutrality. Earlier assistance to Antony's wife Fulvia and other friends of Antony supposedly saved him in the proscriptions (Nepos *Att.* 9.3–10.5), and it was Antony who, probably in 37, arranged Caecilia's marriage to Marcus Agrippa.[2] The betrothal of their infant daughter Vipsania to Octavian's stepson, the future emperor Tiberius, further cemented close ties with Octavian (Nepos *Att.* 19.4–20.3) and brought Atticus' line into the heart of the future imperial house before his death in 32 BC.

Atticus inherited from his father his love of polite letters (Nepos *Att.* 1.2) and probably his antiquarian interests: his father was the dedicatee of a work on the powers of magistrates by Junius 'Gracchanus' (probably himself an equestrian).[3] Atticus himself was widely read in Greek literature (including the historians) and established contacts with Greek literary and scholarly figures, probably to a greater extent than our evidence reveals,[4] but he appears particularly to have reflected the contemporary desire for works in Latin that matched the achievements of the Greeks: his exhortations to Cicero to write on geography and history, for example, belong here, and it may be significant that in the *Brutus* (292–7) and *De legibus* (1.5–7=GT2) it is Atticus who voices criticism of earlier Roman oratory and historiography, not least on the grounds that they do not match their Greek counterparts, whose qualities he was particularly well qualified to assess (cf. also e.g. *acad.* 1.14,18; *fin.* 5.96). This mirrors his anxiety to establish firmly his Roman identity against those who might interpret his prolonged engagement with Athens and with Greek culture unfavourably. That is certainly a major preoccupation of his biographer Nepos, admittedly writing in a period when the adoption of Greek ways had become politically contentious. Nepos does not conceal Atticus' own philhellenism, but he omits some aspects of it,[5] and it occupies a secondary position in the biography, enhancing Atticus' cultural refinement but in no way threatening the primacy of his Roman *persona*.[6] That almost certainly reflects Atticus' own self-construction, as evidenced by his comparative simplicity of lifestyle (Cic. *Att.* 6.1.13; 16.3.1; Nepos *Att.* 13.3–4; 13.6; cf. Cic. *leg.* 2.2), by his retention of much of the old-fashioned house on the Quirinal he inherited from his uncle (Nepos *Att.* 13.2), by his correspondence with Octavian on antiquarian matters and exhortation to restore Rome's supposedly earliest temple, that of Iuppiter Feretrius (Nepos *Att.* 20.2–3), and above all by his own literary works.

Works

Like his fellow equestrian Nepos, Atticus, lacking significant military or political experience and endowed with scholarly interests and attributes, never ventured on

[2] Nepos *Att.* 12.1–2; C. P. Jones, *ZPE* 124 (1999), 92.

[3] Cic. *leg.* 3.49; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 234. Atticus may also, like Varro and Cicero, have studied under the equestrian scholar L. Aelius Stilo: Byrne, *Atticus* (1920), 23.

[4] Greek literature: Byrne, *Atticus* (1920), 27–30; Buckley in Sidwell (ed.), *Pleiades Setting* (2002), 16–17. Greek litterateurs and *grammatici*: Cic. *Att.* 8.11.7; 12.6.2; 13.1.3; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 71–2, 102.

[5] e.g. his friendship with Athenian aristocrats (Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 444–9; 451–2) or Greek men of letters, his Epicureanism, and his knowledge of Greek art.

[6] E. Valette-Cagnac in F. Dupont and E. Valette-Cagnac (eds.), *Façons de parler grec à Rome* (Paris, 2005), 72–3.

major historiographical writing, contenting himself with works of slighter character. On his estate at Buthrotum Atticus created his Amaltheum, a shrine dedicated to the nymph Amalthea and adorned with inscriptions, apparently in Greek and perhaps accompanying statues or busts, one or more of which celebrated the achievements of Cicero (Cic. *Att.* 1.13.1; 1.16.15, 18). Much later Atticus wrote a work concerned with *imagines* (Pliny *nat.* 35.11). If Nepos *Att.* 18.5–6 refers to this rather than the Buthrotum inscriptions, it included portraits of distinguished Romans accompanied by no more than four or five lines of verse that recorded their deeds and offices, and was published after Varro's *Hebdomades* of *c.*39 BC.[7] If Nepos correctly implies that this work, unlike Varro's (I. 416), was concerned solely with Roman political figures, it translated onto a more general plane the role of ancestral *imagines* in inspiring emulation by later descendants (Pol. 6.53.9–10; Sall. *Iug.* 4.5–6; Val. Max. 5.8.3) and will have been a significant precursor of the statue-busts and inscriptions that adorned the Forum Augustum.

Greek memoir on Cicero's consulship

Cicero received this work in early June 60 (T2) soon after despatching his own similar work to Atticus in the spring (*Att.* 1.19.10; 20.6=Cicero 39 T1–2). The coincidence of both men writing such works over two years after the event can be explained by the fact that Atticus had previously seen an apparently earlier draft of Cicero's memoir at Corcyra (Cic. *Att.* 2.1.1=Cicero 39 T3) and the supposition that this prompted him to compose or complete his own work, which was perhaps intended to remedy the delicate state of his recent relations with Cicero.[8] His failure to await the arrival of Cicero's 'consular speeches', some of which he had requested and which, as Cicero observes (*Att.* 2.1.3), would have provided information about Cicero's own actions and words in 63, suggests that he wrote in some haste.

Cicero's categorization of the work as a *commentarius* (T2) does not imply that it was not a continuous narrative or that its spare style was not a conscious choice (cf. I. 371–2). The style probably reflected Atticus' own preferences. It also presumably reinforced a strongly factual mode of self-effacing exposition which implied a claim to enhanced authority as an objective account by an eyewitness intimate with leading players in the events of 63. In fact, however, Atticus' own public stance in December that year, his commitment to the political and financial values and interests that Cicero championed in his consulship, and his friendship with Cicero himself precluded a properly independent perspective. Cicero's own comments on the similarities between Atticus' memoir and his own (T2) confirm this, and Cicero's own role in 63 was undoubtedly heroized. Atticus was, after all, the eulogist of Cicero's achievements (*Att.* 1.16.15; 7.1.4) who attributed the stable establishment of the *res publica* to Cicero's prudence (*Att.* 1.16.6). Other of Atticus' friends are likely to have been accorded flattering mention as occasion arose, in particular the much-admired Cato (cf. Cic. *Att.* 1.17.9; 2.1.8; 3.15.2; Nepos *Att.* 15.3). Yet if Atticus hoped that his

[7] See Horsfall on Nepos *Att.* 18.6; M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis* (Heidelberg, 1999), 258 n. 14. Nepos seems in this chapter to be cataloguing Atticus' published works and the context implies that the verses were in Latin.

[8] Cf. Drumann–Groebe, *GR*[2] 5. 18, 75; A. Lintott, *Cicero as Evidence* (Oxford, 2008), 160, 163.

work would perpetuate his friends' memory and political principles, not least through its use by future historians, that hope was apparently in vain: his memoir was evidently eclipsed by the more artistic and authoritative work of Cicero himself, and there is no trace of its later use.[9]

Annalis

The *Annalis*, inspired by Cicero's *De republica* of 51 BC (T4, perhaps echoing Atticus' preface: Peter 2. xxiiii) and first mentioned in the *Brutus* of late spring/summer 46, probably reached Cicero, its dedicatee (T3), in autumn 47.[10] Its title is securely attested (F7–9) and immediately differentiates it from Nepos' Graecizing *Chronica*. It also potentially links it to the Roman historiographic tradition and may even suggest a modest claim to be an assemblage of facts without historiographical elaboration.[11] Cic. *Brut.* 15 (T3) and *orat.* 120 (T5) clearly imply (as probably does the title) that the material was systematically organized in a single chronological scheme, presumably using the full sequence of eponymous consuls, decemvirs, and consular tribunes as its framework. The work may have begun with an introductory account of Rome's prehistory (F1 with comm.), but the key starting point, as for Cicero and Livy, would have been the foundation of the city (T5; F2). Cicero's citation of a figure 'from the foundation of the city' in F6 may imply that, like the Augustan *fasti Capitolini*, the *Annalis* both facilitated chronological calculations and reinforced its Rome-centred focus by the regular inclusion of such intervals.[12] Whether Atticus systematically incorporated Olympiad dates we do not know: he may not even have given such a date for the foundation of Rome (cf. F2 comm.), and, if he did, this may have been an exceptional use, employed, as in Velleius (1.8.4), to highlight the significance of this epochal event. Cicero's reference to him clearly setting out *ordines temporum* ('chronological sequences') in T3 might imply the correlation of Greek and Roman chronological systems in tabular form,[13] but such an arrangement is not otherwise attested for such a chronographic work before Eusebius,[14] and how much weight should be attached to the plural *ordines* here is uncertain.

Atticus' work occupied a single book, covering some seven centuries to an unknown date shortly before that of publication (T5). For the most part the information included must have appeared in the most concise form and barest detail, as F9

[9] Though Atticus appears in the index of sources to Pliny *nat.* 7, there are no concrete grounds for attributing to his Greek memoir the account of Cicero's consulship in *nat.* 7.116–17 (as e.g. Byrne, *Atticus* (1920), 37).

[10] Cic. *Brut.* 11–15 with Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 50.

[11] Cf. esp. Sempronius Asellio 20 F1–2; Cic. *de orat.* 2.52 for the potentially restricted reference of the term. Whether Sempronius Asellio 20 F1–2 refers to existing works of this type is uncertain: against the suggestion (Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 13) that Sempronius Tuditanus had produced such a work in the late second century see above, I. 242.

[12] So Cichorius, *De fastis consularibus* (1886), 250; Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 57.

[13] So Puccioni, *Fortuna med. della OGR* (1958), 148–50; *Atti del 1 congresso internazionale di studi Ciceroniani* (Rome, 1961), 1. 250; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 27–8. There is no basis for Feeney's assertion (ibid. 23) that to 'correlate with the Roman consuls, Atticus . . . used the archons of his adopted city as the backbone of his work', especially as archon dates would mean little to a Latin-reading public.

[14] R. Helm, *Eusebius' Chronik und ihre Tabellenform, Abh. Preuss. Akad. Wissenschaften Jahrgang 1923. Phil.-hist. Kl. Nr.4* (Berlin, 1924), 3–18.

implies.[15] Selectivity of material was obviously essential, but as well as laws, peace-agreements, and wars (T1), it will also have registered major institutional innovations (as in F3), and important cultural developments were not neglected (F6). Whether Atticus regularly listed censors, dictators, and *magistri equitum* like the *fasti Capitolini* we do not know: he certainly did not include lesser magistrates[16] or, presumably, priests. Brugnoli attractively inferred from the verbal parallels between Cic. *orat.* 120 (T5) and Nepos *Att.* 18.2 (T1) that in his preface Atticus set out his objective of including every event of significance with its proper date,[17] and the 'inspiration' provided by Cicero's *De republica* presumably centred primarily on that work's preoccupation with the chronology of Rome's historical development (which had prompted a specific chronological enquiry by Atticus: Cic. *Att.* 6.1.8; 18).[18] Certainly the principal purposes of the work must have been to provide a convenient source of reference, especially on chronological matters, and a brief overall compendium of Roman history in particular (cf. T3), partly perhaps, like Nepos, for a wider audience than large-scale historiography usually reached; and Cicero's emphasis on the visual accessibility of the contents suggests that, like the *fasti Capitolini*, Atticus may have designed the layout in a way that clearly differentiated the individual years and highlighted significant data.[19]

The Roman focus of the work is also apparent in the genealogical details that Atticus added (T1). It is commonly assumed that this was achieved by the systematic inclusion of the *praenomina* of father and grandfather in the nomenclature of the eponymous magistrates at least, anticipating the practice of the *fasti Capitolini*.[20] Yet that alone would not make tracing descent easy, particularly where non-consular ancestors or descendants had to be assumed. Moreover, Nepos specifies that it was in particular the descendants of *distinguished* men that could now be identified, and his term *subtexuit* (translated here as 'adding') properly means 'append' rather than 'insert'.[21] Perhaps, alongside the inclusion of filiation, Atticus added notes to make clear where a new *cognomen* replaced an old (or at least, as in the *fasti Capitolini*, where a new honorific *cognomen* was acquired), where an adoption meant loss of the original name, or simply, as Nepos' parallel with the family histories suggests, who (or which families) could claim descent from a distinguished man.[22]

Cicero (T5) implies that Atticus included also data on other great powers and notable monarchs, albeit presumably more sparingly, and hence Cicero can describe the work as embracing 'the whole history of the past' (T3). Atticus' own predilections will have ensured a prominent place for figures from the great days of Athens, including certainly the major sixth- and fifth-century politicians (cf. F4). Whether he also included major cultural figures we do not know but, like Velleius Paterculus

[15] Cf. Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 164–5.

[16] Cic. *Att.* 12.5b; 13.30.2, 32.3, 33.3; 16.13a(b).2 with Mommsen, *Chron.*[2] 145 n. 274.

[17] G. Brugnoli, *RCCM* 2 (1960), 330 n. 10; cf. Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 64.

[18] Cf. Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire*, 58–9; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 227 n. 94.

[19] So Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 60; cf. 57 n. 1 (comparing the Oxyrhynchus epitome of Livy); cf. also P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 69 (1979), 129–31.

[20] So esp. Cichorius, *De fastis consularibus* (1886), 251–2.

[21] As Cichorius, ibid. 252; *contra* Beck–Walter 2. 359.

[22] An occasional practice in Velleius (2.2.1; 3.1; 8.1; 10.2; 17.2), who has been thought to be indebted to the *Annales* for this and other genealogical material (cf. Byrne, *Atticus* (1920), 50–1).

later, Atticus presumably sought to provide his readers with basic factual details and a chronological context for figures and events from the Greek past that they were likely to encounter in literature or oratory (or the Greek political, military, cultural, and even athletic celebrities whose statues or busts adorned their villas), as well perhaps as providing some sense of the chronological relationship between, and different pace of, developments in the Greek and Roman worlds, and the progressive supersession of Greece by Rome. It may also be significant that three of the surviving fragments concern contacts between the Greek and Roman worlds and two at least present those contacts in a favourable light (F1, F7, F9 with comm.). Whilst the *Annalis* certainly attested its author's Roman identity and passion for the Roman past as Nepos suggests, it may also have presented Rome's engagement with the Greek world and Greek culture in a strongly positive light, reflecting Atticus' own integration of Greek culture with his Roman identity.

Nothing specific is known about Atticus' sources. Probably blessed himself with a prodigious memory (Cic. *leg.* 2.45) and able to call on the assistance of trained slaves and freedmen, he certainly had access to the chronographic works of Apollodorus and Nepos.[23] He could also have used synchronistic tables based on Apollodorus as well as Castor's *Χρονικῶν Ἐπιτομή* ('Chronological Summary'), which probably included consuls alongside archons and Olympiads for synchronistic dating.[24] He presumably used existing books containing magisterial lists and some at least of the historians; and for key literary dates, including the new, higher dating for the origins of Roman literary drama, he very probably consulted Varro's *De poetis* (comm. on F6). Cicero professes high regard for his friend's industry and scrupulous adherence to attested fact (T3, F5).[25] That may be over-optimistic. Although for the first plebeian tribunes he may have consciously rejected the fabrications of the later annalists (cf. F3 comm.), it would be unrealistic to expect Atticus to exercise radical critical scrutiny on the legends of early Rome, but if he incorporated or even invented the anomalous dictator years (F2 comm.) and supplied filiations (and *cognomina*) extensively even for the earliest period, the work certainly included creative reconstruction of a questionable kind, making its broader reliability uncertain.[26]

This conclusion would be reinforced if we could confidently attribute to Atticus some of the suspect datings in Cicero's later works that moderns have often ascribed to the *Annalis*, such as that of Plato's visit to Italy in *sen.* 41 (cf. Gell. 17.21.28–9).[27] It is, admittedly, highly probable that Cicero made more extensive use of Atticus' work

[23] Assistants: Cic. *Att.* 12.22.2(?); 13.33.3; Byrne, *Atticus* (1920), 14–15. Apollodorus: cf. Cic. *Att.* 12.23.2 (F9); F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), 35; also the resumé of the scope of Apollodorus' work in ps.-Scymnos *perieg.* 25–31 with Nepos *Att.* 18.2 (T1).

[24] Apollodorus: F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), 58; A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius* (Lewisburg and London, 1979), 159. Castor: F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2B *Kommentar*, 815; Kubitschek, *RE* 10. 2352–3; G. Perl, *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischer Jahrzählung* (Berlin, 1957), 141–5.

[25] P. Boyancé, *REA* 42 (1940), 388–392; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 27.

[26] Even for the later republic Atticus' filiations (if he provided them consistently) may not have been wholly accurate: Cicero in *Brut.* 99, possibly drawing on the *Annalis*, gives C. Fannius (cos. 122), as C.f. when he was almost certainly M.f. (I. 244). It is certainly a *petitio principii* to assume that Cicero must be correct because he will be drawing on the *Annalis* (as Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 288–9).

[27] So esp Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 52–93; cf. Byrne, *Atticus* (1920), 41–6, with helpful tabulation of Münzer's conclusions (45–6). *Contra*, Peter 2. xxiii n. 1; Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 168–9. Cf. also C. A. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum* (Cambridge, 2005), 330.

than we can now discern, but it is impossible to isolate debts with any certainty, not least because Cicero had other sources available (including the chronographic works of Nepos and, later, Libo). Similar uncertainties attend the use of Atticus' work by the *fasti Capitolini*.[28] However, the very creation and form of the latter, which use a variant of the chronological scheme employed by Atticus and Varro, were undoubtedly deeply indebted to the chronographic works of the late republic and drew on them extensively; and what we know about the *Annalis* certainly permits surmise about overall similarities (above) and specific debts,[29] even if inevitably conjectural.

Direct use of the *Annalis* is not attested beyond Asconius (the citations in the Virgil scholiast (F1) and Solinus (F2) will be second-hand). Pliny *nat.* 35.11 refers to his work on *imagines* and certainly drew on one or more of his works elsewhere (T6), but whether they included the *Annalis* we cannot say. Use of the work by Velleius or Gellius is similarly and avowedly conjectural.[30]

Family histories

Our knowledge of these is limited to the information provided by Nepos in T1. Atticus' close friendship with M. Junius Brutus went back certainly to 51 BC (Cic. *Att.* 6.1.3, etc.) and probably earlier.[31] Claudius Marcellus is probably C. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 50 BC), whom Cicero suggests Atticus consult on a matter of family history in March 45 and who died in 40 BC.[32] Fabius Maximus is clearly Q. Fabius Maximus, the suffect consul of 45 BC, who died on 31 December that year. 'Scipio Cornelius' is, however, problematic. Münzer assumes that the reference is to Q. Caecilius Metellus Scipio (cos. 52) and supposes that he and Fabius solicited a work on the Aemilii and Fabii in the second half of 58 BC in anticipation of their joint curule aedileship in 57.[33] Metellus Scipio is, however, never elsewhere termed 'Scipio Cornelius' and such a form of the name would be particularly strange here where (e.g.) 'Metellus Scipio' would identify him unambiguously.[34] Linderski therefore emends Nepos' text to introduce an attested nomenclature of Metellus Scipio, but his assumption that the latter must be the individual referred to remains unproven:[35] the

[28] Cichorius, *De fastis consularibus* (1886), 245–57 (with earlier bibliography).

[29] Cf. e.g. Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 87–8. It may, for example, be suggestive that the *cognomen* Atticus is attributed in the *fasti Capitolini* (and *acta triumphalia*) to A. Manlius Torquatus (cos. 244, 241): he is the only other republican individual so styled and a member of a family with which Atticus had close ties (Nepos *Att.* 1.4; 11.2; 15.3).

[30] Velleius: see n. 22; cf. E. A. Kramer, *Historia* 54 (2005), 154–5. Gellius: see 1. 420. G. Brugnoli (*RCCM* 2 (1960), 329–32) refutes the view (Puccioni, *Fortuna med. della OGR* (1958), 139–54) that the *annalis* is the 'Latin history' cited by Hieron. *chron.* 77b (=Nepos 45 F1b).

[31] Cf. Drumann–Groebe, *GR*^{2} 5, 83; for Atticus' friendship with Brutus' mother Servilia see Nepos *Att.* 11.4 (cf. Cic. *Att.* 15.17.2).

[32] Cic. *Att.* 12.22.2; Münzer, *RE* 3. 2736.

[33] Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 95–9. The joint aedileship is, however, unproven: see esp. C. F. Konrad, in J. Linderski (ed.), *Imperium sine fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic* (Stuttgart, 1996), 134–8, 140.

[34] For the attested forms of nomenclature and discussion of our text see J. Linderski, *Roman Questions II* (Stuttgart, 2007), 140–52.

[35] Following Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 98, he assumes that Cicero's knowledge of Metellus Scipio's ancestry in *Brutus* 212–13 derives from Atticus' monograph, but Cicero evinces familiarity with a recondite detail of that ancestry in *dom.* 123 (57 BC) and with the offices of one of Metellus' Scipionic forebears in *Att.* 6.1.17–18 (Feb. 50 BC), both written before Atticus' treatise on Linderski's reconstruction.

transmitted 'Scipio Cornelius' could refer to another individual, e.g. the Cornelius Scipio Salvitto whom Caesar took to Africa in 46.[36]

This issue is linked to further proposed emendations which suppose that Atticus' history of the Aemilii and Fabii was written solely at the behest of Fabius Maximus and that he wrote a separate history of the Cornelii (and, for Linderski, the Metelli) at the request of Scipio. These suggestions are based on the contention that a Cornelius Scipio would hardly forgo an account of his own *gens* and that the Cornelii Scipiones had only a tangential link with the Aemilii and Fabii (the elder Africanus married the sister of L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 182, 168) and two of Paulus' sons were adopted by a Scipio and a Fabius Maximus respectively). This argument has force, but the extensive supplementation of Nepos' text that Linderski in particular assumes is unpersuasive: Nepos' text rarely has lacunae of more than a single word[37] and there is no obvious palaeographic explanation of the losses presupposed here. Moreover, if Q. Fabius Maximus exploited his equally tangential link with the Scipios, placing a statue of Scipio Aemilianus on the *fornix Fabianus* at its restoration during his aedileship[38] and naming one of his sons Africanus Fabius Maximus, our Scipio might have been equally eager to appropriate the glories of the Aemilii and Fabii, particularly if his family had contracted other marriage ties with these *gentes*.[39] The possibility remains open, therefore, that 'Scipio' and Fabius Maximus jointly requested a history of these lineages from Atticus.[40]

If 'Scipio' is Metellus Scipio, his request to Atticus must precede his death in 46 and presumably antedates the civil war.[41] If another Scipio is in question, it becomes a plausible conjecture that all these works were requested as a result of the genealogical material in the *Annalis* and soon after its publication.[42] These were probably the first works of their kind in Latin literature and differed notably from Greek genealogical writing:[43] whether or not they included any reference to the supposed legendary ancestry of some of these families, Nepos shows that their primary focus was the sequence of republican office-holders, in keeping with the priority accorded to them in aristocratic claims to inherited status and prestige. That locates them firmly within

[36] See I. 386–7; R. A. Billows, *AJAH* 7 (1982), 61; A. Marshall, *Latomus* 52 (1993), 313–15.

[37] Marshall's Teubner text admits longer lacunae only at *Lys.* 2.3; *Chabr.* 1.3; *Hann.* 6.1.

[38] *ILLRP* 392 with Cic. *Vat.* 28; L. Chioffi, *Gli elogia augustei del Foro Romano* (Rome, 1996), 26–36; Y. Schmuhl, *Römische Siegesmonumente republikanischer Zeit* (Hamburg, 2008), 110–13.

[39] A possibility noted by Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 96; cf. C. Settipani, *Continuité gentilice et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale* (Oxford, 2000), 51.

[40] There are no grounds for supposing that Atticus composed other genealogical treatises which Nepos overlooks (as D. Sansone, *SLLRH* 4 (1986), 269–77).

[41] For a possible context in late 51/50 BC see J. Linderski, *Roman Questions II* (Stuttgart, 2007), 144–6. For arguments that Cicero in the *Brutus* already draws on Atticus' family histories see n. 35; Douglas on *Brut.* 109, 136.

[42] Cf. A. Marshall, *Latomus* 52 (1993), 311, 314–15. Nipperdey's argument (on Nepos *Att.* 18.4) for dating the history of the Claudii Marcelli to the period 45–40 BC has no force, but it may be significant that Cic. *Att.* 12.22.2 (March 45 BC) is the first attested occasion on which Cicero asks Atticus to search out family or prosopographic information. Cf. also the stemma Atticus created for Brutus in one of his villas (Cic. *Att.* 13.40.1: August 45 BC), probably based on, or contemporary with, the family history Atticus compiled.

[43] H. J. Bäumerich, *Über die Bedeutung der Genealogie in der römischen Literatur* (diss. Cologne, 1964), 28–9; R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), esp. 102–8, 114–15; cf. U. Walter in K.-J. Hölkeskamp *et al.* (eds.), *Sinn (in) der Antike* (Mainz, 2003), 263–4.

the more profound (or at least more overt) preoccupation with ancestry in the late republic, particularly among patrician families, which manifests itself in the revival of obsolete nomenclature, the circulation of funeral eulogies, coinage, and public monuments. For all the families whose members solicited Atticus' aid their days of glory belonged in the past (although the Claudii Marcelli enjoyed a tenure of successive consulships in the years 51–49) and both Fabius Maximus and Brutus had already publicly commemorated their distinguished ancestry.[44] This was all the more necessary since Fabius' father had suffered the humiliation of forfeiting the right to manage his own property because of his profligate ways, and Brutus' father had been killed, presumably as a public enemy, during the suppression of Lepidus' rising in 77 BC.[45] The works Atticus produced probably did not enjoy wide circulation[46] but they were surely to be employed as a basis for future further propagation of the claim to distinguished descent.

The primary interest of Atticus' clients was clearly in their own line of descent together with their relationship to distinguished collaterals, and this presumably influenced the form that the work took.[47] Nepos attests that offices (with dates) were listed and, despite his silence, military and other notable deeds must also have been included. How far Atticus offered a full genealogy of the *gens* or branch of the *gens* in question remains uncertain, despite Nepos' possible implication of a comprehensive treatment of the Junii at least. The basic framework may (as in Greek genealogical works) have been the father–son sequence, supplemented with such additional material (e.g. through a maternal line or adoption) as added distinction to the family's descent, and perhaps with major surviving branches or lineages treated separately.[48] Atticus' primary sources must have been magisterial and priestly lists, public monuments, and family records, in the form of funeral eulogies, painted stemmata (so far as these already existed), inscriptions accompanying *imagines*, individual recollection, and inherited oral tradition. Such material was notoriously unreliable (Cic. *Brut.* 62; Livy 8.40.4–5), but Atticus had no interest in underplaying each family's distinction or achievements. Moreover, for the early republic in particular

[44] Fabius: see I. 351 and n. 38 (*fornix Fabianus*); also Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 149–52. Brutus: Crawford, *RRC* no. 433; U. Walter in K.-J. Hölkeskamp *et al.* (eds.), *Sinn (in) der Antike* (Mainz, 2003), 272–4. For the Claudii Marcelli cf. H. I. Flower, *CA* 19 (2000), 46–7; M. Cadario, *Ostraka* 14 (2005), 147–77.

[45] Elder Fabius: Cic. *Tusc.* 1.81; Val.Max. 3.5.2; Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 95. Brutus' father: Livy *per.* 90; Val. Max. 6.2.8; Plut. *Pomp.* 11.3–8; App. *b.c.* 2.111.464; Oros. 5.22.17; Zonar. 10.2. Fabius himself may have been no popular favourite: cf. Suet. *Iul.* 80.2.

[46] Münzer (*Hermes* 40 (1905), 99) conjectures that Augustus drew on Atticus' history of the Claudii Marcelli for the funeral eulogy of his nephew in 23 BC (Dio 53.30.5; Plut. *Marc.* 30.5; *comp. Pelop. Marc.* 1.8), but otherwise these works leave no later trace.

[47] Cf. Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 99 (with E. Flaig, in O. G. Oexle (ed.), *Memoria als Kultur* (Göttingen, 1995), 140–4). For the 'appropriation' of collaterals cf. E. Badian, *PBSR* 52 (1984), 59.

[48] The discussion of the descendants of the elder Cato in Gell. 13.20.1–17 (based on funeral eulogies and a memoir on the family) may offer guidance here. For the inclusion of individuals from a female line cf. the incorporation in ancestral display, both in the *atrium* and in funeral processions, of *imagines*, at least of her father and grandfather, that might be brought by a bride (E. Flaig, *Ritualisierte Politik. Zeichen, Gesten und Herrschaft im alten Rom* (2nd edn., Göttingen, 2004), 62–6). On the other hand, individuals such as Messalla Rufus (42) and Messalla Corvinus (61) were anxious to exclude supposed interlopers from their family line (Pliny *nat.* 35.8=Messalla Rufus 42 T2; cf. also Cicero's ironic advice to Papirius Paetus in *fam.* 9.21).

he probably had to resort to creative reconstruction, e.g. to furnish a viable line of descent, particularly for Brutus' claim to count Servilius Ahala and L. Junius Brutus (cos. 509 BC) among his ancestors. He may have made similar efforts to establish the descent of the plebeian Claudii Marcelli from the patrician Claudii.[49]

(AD)

[49] Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 59–61.

34

T. Ampius Balbus

Editions: Peter 2. lvix–lx, 45.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 351; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 284; Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 463–4.

INTRODUCTION

T. Ampius Balbus was tribune of the plebs in 63 BC, and praetor in 59, as may be deduced from his governorship of Asia the following year, attested by numismatic evidence (*MRR* 2. 197). He was probably a candidate for the consulship in 55 BC (*Schol. Bob.* 126 Stangl) and was active on Pompey's side in the civil war, serving as a propraetorian legate in Asia, where according to Caesar he planned to rob the temple of Artemis at Ephesus (Cic. *Att.* 8.11B2; *fam.* 2.16.3, 6.12.3; Caes. *BCiu.* 3.105.1–2; Jos. *AJ* 14.229–30, 238). Cicero was a close friend (*fam.* 13.70) and used his connections to friends of Caesar to have him recalled from exile; others opposed him, describing Balbus vividly as *tuba belli ciuilis* ('trumpet of civil war'), according to Cicero (*fam.* 6.12.3). In the same letter, of September 46 BC, encouraging Balbus to hope for his recall, Cicero refers to his writing and indicates that it was historical in character (T1). It is not clear from the one preserved fragment whether Balbus wrote a narrative history, a series of biographies, or a collection of historical information, e.g. in the manner of Valerius Maximus.

(CJS)

35

P. Licinius Apollonius

Principal discussions: E. Klebs, 'Apollonius (60)', *RE* 2 (1895), 124; A. W. Lintott, 'A historian in Cicero: *ad familiares*—P. Licinius (?) Apollonius', *RhM* 119 (1976), 368.

INTRODUCTION

Apollonius is known only from Cic. *fam.* 13.16, a letter of recommendation sent to Caesar in 45 BC. He was the freedman of P. Licinius Crassus, who died fighting with his father at Carrhae in 53 BC. From the letter we learn that Apollonius followed Cicero to Cilicia, and also served in Caesar's war in Alexandria. In 45 he went to Spain to join Caesar, taking Cicero's testimonial with him. Whether Apollonius ever fulfilled his plan to commemorate the deeds of Caesar in Greek (T1), we do not know; but Cicero commends his learning and his ability, and adds that he has been engaged in this kind of literary activity (viz. narrating events) for some time, implying that he had already produced some historical work(s). Lintott plausibly suggests that many of the vivid and circumstantial details of the Parthian campaign in Plutarch's *Crassus*, which are mostly favourable to the Crassi, derive from an eyewitness account of it by Apollonius.

(CJS)

36

L. Scribonius Libo

Editions: Peter 1^2. cccIxxvi–cccIxxviii, 315.

Principal discussions: F. Münzer, 'L. Scribonius (20) Libo', *RE* 2A (1921), 881–5; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 323–4; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 267–9, 281.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The identity of this author, who is referred to by Cicero simply as 'Libo', is open to question. But he is likely to be the same Libo that Cicero refers to elsewhere (and in the same way) in his correspondence, namely the staunch Pompeian L. Scribonius Libo (cos. 34). What follows is based on that assumption, which is probable, but not entirely certain.[1]

L. Scribonius Libo came from a long-established praetorian family.[2] Münzer estimated his date of birth to be around 90 BC, partly by guesses as to the age of members of his family, and partly by the dates of his political offices. However, it should be noted that what appears to be his first office, that of moneyer in 62 BC, is thought by Crawford (*RRC* 1. 439) to have been held by his father. In 56 he lobbied with P. Plautius Hypsaeus for Pompey to receive the command in Egypt (Cic. *fam.* 1.1.3), and was evidently one of Pompey's closest intimates; in *c.*55 his daughter married Pompey's younger son Sextus. He backed Pompey to the hilt in 49 (Cic. *Att.* 9.11.4), and was one of his legates (Flor. 2.13.31; see Broughton, *MRR* 2. 269). Whether he had already held the praetorship, as Münzer thought (cf. *MRR* 2. 248), is unclear.

Early in 49 Mark Antony drove him from Etruria (Lucan 2.462, Flor. 2.13.19; cf. Caes. *BCiu.* 1.11.4), whereupon he took command of Ampius Balbus' troops in Campania (Cic. *Att.* 7.12.2, 8.11.B2) and followed Pompey to Brundisium. Caesar tried to persuade him to mediate but failed (Caes. *BCiu.* 1.26.3–5). He commanded the Adriatic fleet, defeated Dolabella and captured C. Antonius (Caes. *BCiu.* 3.5.3, 8.4; Lucan 4.433; Schol. Bern. p. 135; Flor. 2.13.31; Dio 41.40.1; Oros. 6.15.8–9). In 48 he tried to negotiate a truce at Oricum (Caes. *BCiu.* 3.15–18), and became chief officer in the fleet when Bibulus died (Dio 41.48.1), but failed to block Antony at Brundisium (Caes. *BCiu.* 3.23–4; Plut. *Ant.* 7; Dio 41.48.1–4). He seems to have been reconciled with Caesar after Pharsalus, but escaped proscription in 43 by taking

[1] On this question cf. Münzer, *RE* 2A. 884; Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 5. 349.

[2] L. Scribonius Libo held the praetorship in 204, and a namesake, perhaps his son, did so in 192; a third L. Scribonius Libo achieved fame as tribune of the plebs in 149 (see comm. on Cato 5 F104–7).

refuge with his son-in-law Sextus Pompeius. His sister Scribonia was briefly Octavian's wife (Augustus 60 F11). In 35 he abandoned Sextus Pompeius and went over to Antony, with whom he held the consulship in 34. He may have survived well into the principate. In the inscription referring to the Arvales of 21 and 20 BC (*CIL* 6.32338, I.3 Scheid) we find *|s Libo*; this could be our Libo, or M. Livius Drusus Libo (cos. 15); see Syme, *AA* 46.

His descendants were socially and politically important during the early principate.[3]

Work

During the mid-40s Libo appears in the peaceful company of Cicero and his circle. He was a friend of Cicero and M. Marius (*fam.* 7.4); he knew about the progress of Varro's *De lingua Latina* and is described as enthusiastic (T2).[4] Finally, in 45, we find Cicero using a work of Libo's called *Annalis* to check up on the dates of various officials (F1a–b);[5] we learn that Cicero was planning a work set in 146 BC, and was trying to get his facts straight about the commission that accompanied L. Mummius. He could not understand the career of Sempronius Tuditanus, but he was confusing father and son; see on C. Sempronius Tuditanus (no. 10).

It is at least conceivable, therefore, that the work was not unlike Atticus' *liber annalis* (see introduction to no. 33), and sought simply to set down various dates and careers. It cannot have been very easy to use; Cicero's elementary mistake is hard to comprehend if the work was clearly set out, since he could see relatively easily both Sempronii Tuditani (they were not separated by many years).

F2, if it really is a reference to Libo, shows that he went on, either in the *Annalis* or in another work, to deal with events of the civil war. On this issue see comm. ad loc.

(CJS)

[3] Syme, *AA* 235–65; H. Lindsay in A. Powell, K. Welch (eds.), *Sextus Pompeius* (London, 2002), 167–86, esp. 167–9.

[4] Varro evidently dedicated a work of more than one volume to him (T3); this may have been his autobiography (H. Dahlmann, *Philologus* 97 (1948), 365–8; and see comm. on Varro 52 F5–6).

[5] T1 brackets Libo with Cotta and Casca; on these two see I. Appendix 1, A8, A11.

37

Munatius Rufus

Editions: Peter 2. lix, 42–4.

Principal discussions: E. Wentzel, 'Über die Quellen, welche Plutarch bei Abfassung der Lebensbeschreibung des jüngeren Kato benutzt hat', *JPhP* 4 (1829), 91–100; Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), esp. 65–9; Münzer, 'Munatius (37) Rufus', *RE* 16 (1935), 554–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 280–1; H. Berthold, 'Cato von Utica im Urteil seiner Zeitgenossen', *Acta Conventus 'Eirene'* 11 (Bratislava, 1971), 129–41; J. Geiger, 'Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus on Cato the Younger', *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 48–72; H. J. Tscheidel, *Caesars 'Anticato': eine Untersuchung der Testimonien und Fragmente* (Darmstadt, 1981), 25–34; R. Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (Darmstadt, 1983), 7–18.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Munatius Rufus was a friend of Cato the Younger and wrote an account of him, which, we are told, was used by Thrasea Paetus (no. 81), who was followed in his turn by Plutarch. Munatius was closely attached to Cato throughout his career, first during his military tribunate in 67 BC (Plut. *Cat. Min.* 9.1–3), and then in 62 when Cato made his way through a body of armed men in the Forum to confront his fellow tribune Metellus Nepos (Plut. *Cat. Min.* 27.6). Pompey unsuccessfully used him as the go-between when seeking the hand of one of Cato's nieces in 62 (Plut. *Cat. Min.* 30.3–5). As F1 and 2 show, he accompanied Cato as governor of Cyprus between 58 and 56 BC, and was evidently close to the women of Cato's household. But when Cato left Italy to join Pompey in 49, Munatius stayed behind in Bruttium, and Cato sent his younger son to him for safety (Plut. *Cat. Min.* 52.4). It is not known if Cato and Munatius ever saw one another again.

Work

Plutarch's use of Munatius' work was avowedly indirect, through Thrasea (T2–3). While it is theoretically possible that the whole of Plutarch's life is a 'fragment' of Munatius (derived from a rehash of the latter's work by Thrasea), with the exception of passages evidently containing Plutarch's own insertions (such as 20.8, where he explains the powers of the tribunes, or the aside in F2 §6 on the taking of sureties),[1]

[1] For another example, Griffin (*Seneca*, 380) points out Plutarch's misinterpretation in 67.3 of Cato's motive for suicide (ἀπαλλάττεσθαι τῶν παρόντων: 'to free himself from his present troubles'), and she draws attention to other passages of Plutarch where the same misinterpretation occurs (*Mor.* 476A and 1076B). For Plutarch's dependence on Munatius via Thrasea see Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 65–8; R. Flacelière, *Plutarque Vies X: Phocion-Caton le Jeune* (Paris, 1976), 65–6; Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 48–72; Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (1983), 7–18; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 10, 13

it is more probable that Thrasea made use of a range of sources, including Munatius, to build up his own picture of Cato, and that Plutarch later did the same,[2] perhaps also consulting Munatius' work for himself (cf. below, introduction to Thrasea (81)). Even so, Geiger is undoubtedly right to suspect that much more in Plutarch's life than is explicitly acknowledged derives, via Thrasea, from Munatius. Cato's military tribunate and journey to Asia, his quaestorship, his conflict with Metellus Nepos in 62, his handling of affairs in Cyprus, and his return, may all derive from this source.[3]

Certainly references to Munatius and his intimacy with Cato are dispersed through the *Life* elsewhere than in the passages printed as F2–3, at 9.1–2, 20.3–4, 27.5, and 52.3. Munatius features as a character in passages in which the personal qualities of Cato and his warmth are brought to the fore, and in anecdotes relating to the women of Cato's household; it is also true that Plutarch's *Cato Minor* is especially rich in such personalia, and the suspicion must be strong that they derive from Munatius.[4] As noted above, however, Cato and Munatius seem to have parted company before the end. Munatius is not mentioned in accounts of the death of Cato in 46, and there is no reason why, if he were there, his presence should have been suppressed by Thrasea Paetus. An obvious explanation is that Munatius was not present at Cato's death, and did not write about it in his work, perhaps because he did not get that far (Geiger for example thinks that it ended with the outbreak of the civil war), or because it did not aim to be a comprehensive account of Cato's life, and contained only personal reminiscences.[5] This issue clarifies the point that we know little or nothing about the work's scope or arrangement, or indeed about its date of composition.

This makes it difficult to assess its place in the literary battles over Cato's life and personality that broke out after his suicide at Thapsus in 46 BC, and in particular whether it was written before or after Caesar's *Anticato*, and whether it was responding to it, or was itself one of the works that stimulated it. Geiger points out that many of the passages in Plutarch that certainly or probably go back to Munatius occur in polemical contexts and appear to be denying anti-Catonian accusations.[6] The problem here is that it may have been Plutarch's immediate source, Thrasea, who attempted to refute attacks on Cato by using information taken from Munatius. Although the case cannot be proved either way, it is on balance more probable that Munatius was aware of the criticisms of Cato and was himself responding to them. Geiger has suggested that the juxtaposition at Plut. *Cat. Min.* 11 of pen and sword, which is common in Latin but not in Greek, is owed to Plutarch's translation of Munatius (via Thrasea).[7] If so, since the phrase occurs in a comment on Caesar's *Anticato*, it would follow that Munatius was answering Caesar's accusations. It is also worth noting that Cicero makes no mention of Munatius in his references to his own *Cato* or that of Brutus, or to the attacks by Caesar and Hirtius; this perhaps

[2] Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 60–1.

[3] Ibid. 50–4. See comm. on F1 for other passages that might go back to Munatius.

[4] Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 13.

[5] Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 52, 56–7; *contra*, Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (1983), 18 n. 49.

[6] They include Plut. *Cat. Min.* 36.5–37.1, printed at the start of F1. In general see Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 54–5; Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (1983), 16; cf. Tschiedel, *Caesars 'Anticato'* (1981), 28–9.

[7] Geiger, *CQ* 52.2 (2002), 632–4; Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (1983), 15–16.

signifies that Munatius' memoirs had not yet been published.[8] However that may be, it is in any case likely that the work was written after Cato's suicide, and played its part in the construction of his extraordinary posthumous reputation (cf. comm. on F1).

Geiger presumes that the work was written in the manner of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* and points out that Plut. *Cat. Min.* 25, 30.9–10, and 37, all of which perhaps derive from Munatius, contain information out of chronological context, unlike the rest of Plutarch's life, and that this feature may reflect the original.[9] Fehrle, on the other hand, is more inclined to regard Munatius' *σύγγραμμα* as a full biography.[10]

(CJS, BML, TJC)

[8] Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 55. For Cicero's references to his own *Cato* see *orat.* 35; *Att.* 12.4.2, 5.2; to Brutus': *Att.* 12.21.1; 13.46.2; to attacks by Caesar: *Att.* 13.50.1, 51.1; *inp.* 94; and by Hirtius: *Att.* 12.40.1, 41.4, 44.1, 45.2, 48.

[9] Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 56–7.

[10] Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (1983), 15.

38

L. and Q. Aelius Tubero

Editions: Peter 1². ccclxvi–ccclxxiii, 308–12; Chassignet 3. lxxvi–lxxxi, 151–6; Beck–Walter 2. 346–57.

Principal discussions: F. Lachmann, *De fontibus historiarum T. Livii* (Göttingen, 1822–8) 1. 40–1; 2. 26–7; H. Meyer, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Zurich, 1833), 210–11 (2nd edn. (1842), 501–3); C. Nipperdey, 'Zur Geschichte der römischen Historiographie', *Philologus* 6 (1854), 131–40, esp. 137–9 (= *Opuscula* (Berlin, 1877), 407–8); G. F. Unger, 'Die Glaubwürdigkeit der capitolinischen Consulntafeln', *NJPhP* 143 (1891), 289–321, esp. 318–21; E. Klebs, 'L. Aelius (150) Tubero', *RE* 1 (1893), 534–5; 'Q. Aelius (156) Tubero', ibid. 535–8; F. P. Bremer, *Iurisprudentiae antehadrianae quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1896–1901), 1. 358–63; W. F. Soltau, 'Macer und Tubero', *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 409–32, 639–52; Schanz–Hosius 1⁴ (1927), 321–3; Rosenberg, *Einleitung* (1921), 138–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 261–3; Ogilvie, *Comm.* (1965), 16–17; Badian, 'Early historians' (1966), 22–3; Malcovati *ORF*⁴ (1976), 527–8; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), esp. 135–9.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The Tuberones may have been descended from P. Aelius Paetus (cos. 337), the first Aelius known to have held curule office;[1] for if in Cicero's day the appellation *nobilis* depended on descent from a consular, this is the easiest explanation of passages where he applies it to members of the Tubero family (Cic. *Lig.* 27; *rep.* 1.31).[2] The first known Tuberones are P. Aelius Tubero, pr. 201, and Q. Aelius Tubero, tr. pl. 193. Another Quintus Tubero, perhaps the grandson of the praetor of 201, was the Stoic philosopher who is one of the interlocutors in the *De republica* (see n. 2) and whose limited oratorical ability is described at Cic. *Brut.* 117–18.[3] Of his children we know

[1] Thus M. Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility* (Oxford, 1969), 31.

[2] If for *nobilitas* one needed merely ancestors who had held curule office, then the Tuberones qualified as descendants of the praetor of 201 (for whom see below). With this explanation, however, Laelius' description (in Cic. *rep.* 1.31) of Q. Tubero as *nobilissima in familia . . . natus* is awkward; but the context is hardly neutral, as Laelius further points out that Tubero was also the grandson of Aemilius Paullus and nephew of Scipio Aemilianus.

[3] That this is the Q. Tubero to whom Gellius refers at 1.22.7 *M. autem Cicero in libro, qui inscriptus est de iure ciuili in artem redigendo, uerba haec posuit: 'nec uero scientia iuris maioribus suis Q. Aelius Tubero defuit, doctrina etiam superfuit.' . . . disciplinas enim Tubero stoicas dialecticas percalluerat* ('M. Cicero also, in his book *On Reducing the Civil Law to a Skill*, wrote as follows: "Assuredly Q. Aelius Tubero was not inferior to his predecessors in knowledge of the law, and in learning was even their superior." . . . for Tubero was thoroughly conversant with Stoic dialectics') is made likely by *stoicas*; see e.g. Peter, *HRR* 1¹ (1870), ccclviii. In the second edition (1². ccclxvii) Peter referred this passage to our Quintus; but the past tenses used by Cicero do not suggest a man still living, and our Quintus was still a young man when Cicero died. Krause 321–2 makes the Stoic Quintus the father of the Lucius to be discussed below; but since Lucius was almost

nothing, unless one of them be the praetorian C. Tubero who was said to have been rescued live from his funeral pyre (Plin. *nat.* 7.173 = Messalla Rufus 42 F1). The next known Tuberones are the historians, Cicero's friend Lucius and his son Quintus.

At *Lig.* 1 Cicero describes Quintus as a *propinquus*.[4] At *Lig.* 21 he tells us that he and Lucius were educated together in the same house, had shared their military *contubernium*, were connected by marriage, had been friends all their lives, and shared common *studia*, by which he probably means an interest in philosophy and other literary pursuits.[5] Perhaps then the date of Lucius' birth was not far removed from that of Cicero in 106. Lucius was the senior legate on the staff of Quintus Cicero when he governed Asia as propraetor between 61 and 58 (T1), and on his return he met Marcus Cicero, then in exile in Macedonia, and warned him of plans being made by supporters of Catiline to assassinate him (*Planc.* 100).

We meet Lucius next on the eve of the civil war, when he was asked to govern Africa in the Pompeian interest. This led to a quarrel with Q. Ligarius, who had been left in charge of Africa by the departing governor, C. Considius, which is described most fully in the *Pro Ligario*. Prevented by Ligarius and others from setting foot in Africa, the Tuberones sailed to Macedon and the camp of Pompey (Cic. *Lig.* 25–9), and Quintus, at least, fought with the Pompeians at Pharsalus (*Lig.* 9). From the *Pro Ligario* (9–10), and from Schol. Gronov. 291–2 St. (if independent of the speech), it is clear that both Lucius and Quintus Tubero had been pardoned by Caesar before embarking on their prosecution of Ligarius.

The last we hear of Lucius Tubero is at *Att.* 13.20.2, where Cicero tells Atticus that he could not add to the *Pro Ligario* some tale about the wife and stepdaughter of Tubero, because the speech was already in wide circulation and because Tubero took offence so easily. Cicero probably refers to Lucius rather than Quintus (the story which Atticus had mentioned related to the events of 49 or 48, in which Quintus played only a minor part). That Cicero had a genuine regard for Lucius is not to be doubted: in addition to this passage, he speaks warmly of him at *Q. f.* 1.1.10, and in the *Pro Ligario* he goes out of his way not to offend him.

The main fame of Q. Tubero was as a jurist; and thanks to Pomponius' brief sketch of his life (*dig.* 1.2.2.46) we know rather more about him. This knowledge does not include the date of his birth; but since he can hardly have been younger than 16 when in 48 he fought at Pharsalus, 64 is a *terminus ante quem*. According to Pomponius he studied as a youth with Ofilius and abandoned oratory in favour of jurisprudence after his failure to secure the conviction of Ligarius; we have no reason to reject either statement. Elsewhere Pomponius (*dig.* 1.2.2.51) reveals that he married a daughter of the great jurist Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, and that his own daughter married a Cassius Longinus.

certainly a coeval of Cicero (see below), this Quintus would then have sired him at a relatively advanced age: an anecdote in Cic. *Mur.* 75–6 suggests that he was a candidate for the praetorship not long after 129, which would place his date of birth probably in the 160s. Krause considered the possibility that he could have been the historian Quintus but rightly rejected it because of references to Caesar in the writings of Quintus.

[4] The comment of Schol. Gronov. 292 St. on this passage, that Tubero had married a sister of Cicero, is probably no more than a guess by the scholiast or one of his predecessors. If Cicero had had a sister, we should read of her elsewhere in his voluminous writings.

[5] Our Lucius may have been the L. Tubero who featured in Aenesidemus' Πυρρώνειοι λόγοι (Phot. *bibl.* 212 [169b]), but the date of Aenesidemus is uncertain.

We do not know what magistracies Quintus held, but the consulship was not amongst them. Nevertheless, two of his sons reached this rank: Q. Aelius Tubero as *suffectus* in 11 (his descent from our Quintus made virtually certain by the filiation in the prefatory index to Dio, book 54), Sex. Aelius Catus as *ordinarius* in AD 4 (his descent from our Quintus a very reasonable conjecture).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the dates of whose residence in Italy are uncertain but who published the first book of his *Roman Antiquities* twenty-two years after Augustus had brought peace (i.e. in 7 BC), dedicated his first treatise on Thucydides to a Q. Aelius Tubero, to whom he refers at various points in that treatise and once in his second treatise.[6] Most scholars identify him with our Quintus, and it would certainly have been appropriate to dedicate a treatise on Thucydides to a Roman noble who had himself written history;[7] but we cannot be absolutely certain that the dedicatee was not the suffect consul of 11.

Everything else that we know about Q. Tubero relates to his writings, of which the best-known in antiquity were jurisprudential; their remains are collected by Bremer, *Iurispr. antehadr. quae supersunt* 1 (1896), 358–63.

It is disputed whether the historian to whom our sources refer was Lucius or Quintus. That L. Tubero wrote a history is stated at T1, and many scholars have argued that he was the writer cited by Livy and DH.[8] This view can be correct only if in F8 one reads *Valerius Antias atque Tubero* with Unger and not *Valerius Antias et Q. Tubero*, the reading adopted here (see comm. ad loc.).[9] This passage likewise provides the main evidence that Quintus wrote a history: if it has been interpreted wrongly, then the case for his being included in this volume becomes much slighter. For little weight can be placed on the attestation, or possible attestation, of the *praenomen* Quintus in F15–16: F15 certainly shows that Quintus mentioned that Pompey was for a long time named as Caesar's heir, but it need not come from an historical work;[10] F16 also refers to Julius Caesar, but its ascription to Tubero depends upon uncertain conjectures.[11] That two Tuberones wrote history may seem to be implied by DH's plural Αἴλιοί at T2 (thus Krause, 323), but the ensuing reference to Calpurnii and Gellii (DH later tells us about only one Calpurnius and one Gellius) suggests that the plural is rhetorical and that this passage has no bearing on the two problems just mentioned. The argument that Quintus was too young to have been used by Livy as a source is not compelling. We have noted that Quintus must have been born before 64. If he was born in this year, he would be only five years older than Livy, who was born in 59. However, if his father was born around 106 (see above), then he could easily

[6] *Thuc.* 1. 55; *Amm.* 2.1; cf. *Thuc.* 25 and 35.

[7] But for some slight doubts about this see below.

[8] See e.g. Vossius, *Hist. Lat.*[2] 56–8; Soltau, *Hermes* 29 (1894), 631–3; *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 414–17, 423–32; Cichorius, *RS* 228; Klotz, *RhM* 87 (1938), 48–50; M. Gelzer, *Gnomon* 18 (1942), 229; J. Bayet, *Tite-Live* 4 (Paris, 1946), 38; Badian, 'Early historians', 22; R. Werner, *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), 509–11.

[9] See also Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 46 n. 71; *Comm.* 571.

[10] Soltau (*Hermes* 29 (1894), 632) ascribes it to a juristic writing.

[11] The view—for which see e.g. Badian, 'Early historians', 36 n. 120, R. Werner, *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), 511, and Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 4 n. 9—that Quintus wrote a biography of Julius Caesar cannot be discounted: for interest in Caesar see also the commentary on F3. One might not have expected this ex-Pompeian to be a great admirer of the dictator, but he had been pardoned by him, and the *Pro Ligario* suggests some friendship; see further J. H. Richardson, *CPh* 106 (2011), 155–60.

have been born earlier, for instance *c.*80. If he was born in 80, he would have been 32 at Pharsalus; 36 in 44 (still young enough to be called an *adulescens* at Cic. *Lig.* 9); he could have married in the late 50s in time to have a son who was suffect consul in 11; he could have lived long enough to receive a dedication from Dionysius of Halicarnassus; and he could have written his history *c.*40–35, when he would have been between 40 and 45.[12] That Quintus wrote a history and was the source used by Livy and DH has been accepted by most scholars and seems the most likely theory.[13] If the allusion in F3 to Caesarian reforms of the Lupercalia comes from Tubero and not from the head of DH himself (who cites Tubero), then this becomes even more likely: since the allusion comes in the account of Romulus, one would expect it to have been written early; certainly if Lucius wrote it, it cannot have been in the work about which Cicero knew.[14] Nevertheless, although most of our fragments relate to early Rome, and the implications of T3 are that they come from the work of Quintus, we should be alert to the possibility that some of what is ascribed to Tubero may have been written by Lucius. Therefore in what follows, the non-committal name 'Tubero' will generally be used.[15]

Work

Since F3 refers to Romulus, F4 to Servius Tullius, F8 to 434, F9 10 to 299, F11 to 256, and F12 to the death of Regulus at some point after 255, Tubero's history must have covered at least the period from Romulus to 255; and, since F1 seems to relate to the Trojan horse, it perhaps began with the Sack of Troy and the flight of Aeneas from Troy. F4 on Servius Tullius comes from book 1. If a quite easy conjecture of Gronovius (*nona historia* for *nouae historiae*) is right, then F12 on Regulus would come from book 9 and, if a book of Tubero was roughly equivalent in length to a book of Livy, this would show that Tubero wrote at approximately half the length that Livy did; but reasons for caution in accepting Gronovius' conjecture are given in the commentary. From F7, the chronological context of which is unfortunately irrecoverable, we learn that Tubero reached at least book 14.

We have seen already that there are difficulties in interpreting F15–16, which refer to Julius Caesar. If Reifferscheid's or Moddermann's conjecture is right in F16, either

[12] For this suggested date see e.g. R. Werner, *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), 509, and Chassignet 3. lxxvii.

[13] See e.g. Klebs, *RE* 1. 537; Peter 1. ccclxix; Münzer, *RE* 4. 1481; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 138–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 26; Ogilvie, *JRS* 48 (1958), 46; *Comm.* 16; G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), 130; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 135–9. Apart from the fact that, if right, it would remove our problem, there is little to be said for Krause's hypothesis (121–2) that Quintus completed his father's work; for early disagreement with it see Nipperdey (*Philologus* 6 (1854), 138), who thought that at best the father left some notes for the son to use, an idea taken up by Schanz–Hosius, 1^4. 322. A variant of this view is that of Bardon (*Litt. inconnue*, 1. 26) that Lucius never published his history. Nipperdey himself held that Cicero was wrong to make Lucius a historian; though a bold argument, this does dispose of inconvenient evidence.

[14] See Chassignet 3. lxxix–lxxx, who, however, does not consider the possibility that DH himself may have been responsible for the allusion.

[15] On the basis of an ineliminable MS reading at Gell. 10.28.1 (=F4) *Tubero in historiarum primo* (*Tubero δ: K. Tubero* Fγ), Unger (*NJPhP* 143 (1891), 320–1) argued that the historian was called Caeso. Even though the MS reading is inexplicable (K, a symbol used to indicate a new chapter, is sometimes interpolated into medieval MSS, but its presence here alone in those of Gellius would be surprising), it seems unwise to use this isolated testimony to postulate a third Tubero with a rare and archaic *praenomen*.

Tubero's history continued down until the time of Julius Caesar or (more probably) he wrote a separate biography of Caesar.[16]

Since F4, F5, F6, F11, and F12 all refer to the *historiae* of Tubero, it seems likely that *historia* stood in its title; whether there was some subsidiary title such as *ab urbe condita* is unknown. Most ancient historians wrote annalistically, and since F8 and F9 refer to elections to Rome's annual magistracies, there is no reason to doubt that Tubero too arranged his history in this way.

From the fragments themselves we can learn little about Tubero's historical techniques. In F8 Livy records that he reported the *libri lintei* differently from Macer: this may suggest that he was capable of independent research, something that we do not find in his successor Livy, but he or Livy may simply have made a mistake (see the comm. on Macer, 27 F19). F11–12 on Regulus show that he included the sensational content that we associate with Q. Curtius Rufus or with lost writers such as Clitarchus and Phylarchus. F1 suggests that he took a rationalizing view of the Trojan War, or at least of the wooden horse. To go further involves more or less plausible speculation.

Since Livy states with regard to F8 that Tubero recorded the same information as Valerius Antias and with regard to F10 that he recorded the same information as Licinius Macer, Soltau (*NJPhP* 155 (1897), 425–6) and Klotz (*RhM* 87 (1938), 42–50; *RhM* 88 (1939), 33; *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, 208–10) conjectured that Tubero used the works of Antias and Macer, just as Livy later used the works of Antias, Macer, Tubero himself, and Quadrigarius, and DH the first three of these and others besides; in which case, Tubero's history will have been based on a blend of earlier annals, just like those of Livy and Dionysius. This conjecture, although quite attractive, is not certain: on each occasion Tubero and the other annalist may have a common lost source, for instance Cn. Gellius.

Several attempts have been made to derive parts, often large parts, of the narratives of Livy or DH from Tubero.[17] In principle this is not unreasonable. It is certain that both authors used Tubero, and they may have used him extensively: although Livy cites him only twice (in books 1–10 he cites Macer seven times, Quadrigarius four times, and Antias twice), he cites Polybius only six times between books 30 and 45, even though in these sixteen books huge portions of his narrative are taken from Polybius; moreover, more often than not he cites writers when he disagrees with them or when his sources are divided, rather than when he is following them. As for DH, he cites Macer six times but Antias and Tubero once each. In practice the evidence adduced seldom if ever allows the case to be proved.[18]

Some of this evidence takes the form of alleged allusions to the period 63–44, and especially to the Catilinarian affair,[19] in both Livy and DH: if one accepts both that there are such allusions and that Antias wrote in the Sullan period and not later,[20]

[16] That Livy does not cite Tubero in books 21–45 is significant only if F7, mentioned above, comes from an account of the Hannibalic War (as it probably would were Gronovius' conjecture in F12 correct). The view of Münzer, *RE* 4. 1481, that Livy used Tubero in the fourth decade is uncharacteristically aberrant.

[17] See e.g. Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 409–32, 639–52; Klotz, *RhM* 87 (1938), 32–50; *Mnemosyne* ser. 3.6 (1938), 83–102; *RhM* 88 (1939), 27–36; *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, 208–11.

[18] For a sensible discussion see Walsh, *Livy*, 115–17.

[19] See e.g. Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 425; Klotz, *RhM* 87 (1938), 33, 43–4; Ogilvie, *Comm.* 243.

[20] For Antias' date see introduction to no. 25.

then they can have originated only in either Tubero (the one source of Livy and DH known to have lived late enough) or Livy and DH themselves. Yet, quite apart from the difficulty that such allusions involve only small parts of vast narratives, few are certain: for example, although the letter with which the Vitellii and Aquilii incriminate themselves in the first year of the republic is found in both Livy (2.4.3–4) and DH (5.7.1) (and therefore cannot be the invention of either), it need not necessarily have been modelled on the famous letter of Lentulus to Catiline. Of the allusions that are more certain, Livy himself could have been responsible for at least some.[21]

Making use of the hypothesis that Tubero fused the narratives of Antias and Macer, Soltau (*NJPhP* 155 (1897), 423–32) and Klotz (*RhM* 87 (1938), 42–50; *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, 208–11) argued that material from these two writers sometimes came to Livy and DH not directly from them but via the mediation of Tubero. In particular, Klotz claimed that there are various passages in Livy's first decade in which a writer earlier than Livy has combined two narratives so as to effect a doublet.[22] Although much that Klotz says is exaggerated and over-schematic, some of these doublets do undoubtedly exist,[23] but they need not have been created by a writer as late as Tubero. A certain example of a combination of sources, on which Klotz (*RhM* 87 (1938), 47–8) placed much emphasis, comes in 444, the year of the first consular tribunate: Livy (4.7.10–8.1) and DH (11.61.3–63. 1) both hold that the consular tribunes were forced to abdicate and were replaced by consuls, for whose period of office Macer (27 F17) cited evidence from the *libri lintei*; but other sources knew only of consular tribunes. Klotz held that Tubero combined Antias' version in which there were consular tribunes in the year and Macer's in which there were consuls; but we cannot be certain that the combination was not made first by Macer.[24]

Often Klotz and other source-critics fell into the trap of believing that innovation and combination cannot be made by extant authors (e.g. Livy, DH) but only by those who do not survive (e.g. Tubero); and, because less is known about Tubero than about Macer and Antias, the extent to which he himself innovated may be underestimated: doubtless he thought that he had achieved more than a mere combination of Macer and Antias.

It has been argued that in places the earlier radical narrative of Macer appears in Livy or DH in 'toned down' form, and that the toning down was effected by Tubero.[25] In principle this is again possible: since Tubero wrote after Macer and quite possibly used him as a source, it is quite likely that he did in some way adapt what he found in Macer. In practice, any attempt to prove this labours under various difficulties. First, the original narrative of Macer does not survive. Second, the political tenor of

[21] An allusion to Caesar, plausibly adduced by Klotz, is discussed at Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 589 and 4. 525. There are unquestionably Catilinarian allusions in Livy's account of the downfall of Manlius Capitolinus (Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 481–4 and 4. 517 and 522), but the presence also of allusions to Sallust's *Catiline* makes it likely that they originate with Livy himself. If our Tubero was Lucius, as Soltau and Klotz hold, then it is awkward for their views that Lucius had already written his history by Quintus Cicero's governorship in 61.

[22] Klotz, *Mnemosyne* ser. 3.6 (1938), 83–102, is a study of book 9 from this perspective.

[23] See e.g. Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 269 (on the events of 318–317) and 455 (on the events of 310–309).

[24] For full discussion see the commentary on Macer 27 F17.

[25] See Soltau, *NJPhP* 155 (1897), 423–32.

Tubero's history is uncertain. Soltau (*NJPhP* 155 (1897), 414–17) held that it had an optimate bias. Given the generally conservative prejudices of most members of the Roman upper class and the fact that both Tuberones initally fought against Caesar, this is a reasonable guess; but, since the Aelii were themselves plebeians, it should not be assumed automatically that Tubero's history will have been unsympathetic to the aspirations of the early plebeians. Soltau's further assumption of a special connection with the views of Cicero rests both on his identification of the writer as Lucius and on an overestimation of the importance of these views for others of Cicero's generation.[26] Third, even if Tubero's views were conservative, other annalists (e.g. Valerius Antias) could have written episodes from a conservative standpoint. Fourth, any toning down of Macer could have been done by Livy and DH themselves, neither of whose political views differed much from what Soltau postulates for Tubero.

Soltau (*NJPhP* 155 (1897), 416–17) held too that Tubero used contemporary antiquarian writers such as Atticus, Nepos, and especially Varro (a reasonable assumption, though quite without proof), and that antiquarian digressions in Livy, such as those at 1.44 on the Servian centuriate system and at 8.8 on the Roman legion, came from his work. Tubero certainly described the Servian centuriate organization (F4), but this does not prove that for these passages Livy drew on him rather than other writers who included similar material.

For the view that some of Livy's juridical terminology comes from Q. Tubero see L. Peppe, *Studi sull'esecuzione personale* (Milan, 1981), 38–9. For the view that passages in Livy which recall Thucydides may derive from Tubero (perhaps the dedicatee of Dionysius' first treatise on Thucydides and perhaps therefore especially interested in the author) see the cautious remarks of Ogilvie, *Comm.* 17. For the view that Tubero toned down the annalistic stereotype of the reactionary patrician Claudii see Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 55–139, with the critique of Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 665–9.[27]

So few of the words actually used by Tubero survive that virtually nothing useful can be said about his style. However, F12 displays polysyndeton that would be a little unusual in Livy.

Fragments are ordered here according to our standard criteria. F1 and F3 have no book number but, as all have seen, may be included safely in book 1. F5 may be from the preface (see comm.), but as this is not certain we have printed it after the fragments of book 1 whose context is clearly established. Although T5 shows that Pliny used Tubero as a source, it does not prove that he used his historical work; and the context of F17, where Tubero is explicitly cited, is astronomical not historical.[28] Hence both testimonium and fragment are described as doubtful.

(SPO)

[26] Klotz (*RhM* 87 (1938), 49–50) detected some anti-Ciceronian sentiments in DH and explained these as deriving from Tubero, who had become hostile to Cicero because of the Ligarius affair. These sentiments are very uncertain.

[27] J. H. Richardson, *CPh* 106 (2011), 155–60 has recently argued that DH's remarks at 5.18.1–2 (that later Bruti could not have been descended from the alleged consul of the first year of the republic, since he had no children and since these later Bruti were plebeian whereas the first Brutus was patrician) derive from Tubero (who, he argues, was not a supporter of the Bruti who assassinated Caesar). This is possible; but anxiety about the relationship of later plebeian families to earlier patrician ones pre-dates Tubero (see Cic. *Brut.* 62), and the relationship of the alleged consul of the first year of the republic to later Bruti would have been a very obvious example of the problem.

[28] See Peter, *HRR* 1[1] (1870), ccclx; Hertz, *De historicorum Romanorum reliquiis* (Breslau, 1871), 13.

39

M. Tullius Cicero

Editions: Peter 2. iii–xvi, 3–5; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 235 (Greek memoir); G. Garbarino, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Fragmenta* (Milan 1984), 21–7, 87–92.

Principal discussions: P. Weizsäcker, 'Ciceros hypomnema und Plutarch', *JhKPh* 111 (1875), 417–28; J. Schliephacke, 'Über die griechischen Quellen zur catilinarischen Verschwörung' (*Program Goslar*, 1877), 3–37; G. Thouret, 'De Cicerone, Asinio Pollione, C. Oppio rerum Caesarianarum scriptoribus', *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 306–24; E. Schmidt, *De Ciceronis commentario de consulatu Graece scripto* (diss. Lubeck, 1884); K. Buresch, 'Die Quellen zu den vorhandenen Berichten von der catilinarischen Verschwörung', in *Commentationes in hon. O. Ribbeckii* (Leipzig, 1888), 217–34; E. Schwartz, 'Die Berichte über die catilinarische Verschwörung', *Hermes* 32 (1897), 554–608; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 530–4; K. Büchner, 'M. Tullius (29) Cicero', *RE* 7A (1939), 1267–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 273–5; P. A. Brunt, 'Three passages from Asconius', *CR* 7 (1957), 193–5; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* (1966), 2.1. 182, 378–9; O. Lendle, 'Ciceros *ὑπόμνημα περὶ τῆς ὑπατείας*', *Hermes* 95 (1967), 90–109; E. Rawson, 'History, historiography, and Cicero's *expositio consiliorum suorum*', *LCM* 7.8 (1982), 121–4 (=*Roman Culture* (1990), 408–15); J. Moles, 'Plutarch, *Crassus* 13, 4–5 and Cicero's *de consiliis suis*', *LCM* 7.9 (1982), 136–7; C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch and Catiline', *Hermes* 113 (1985), 311–29, revised in, and cited from, *Plutarch and History*, 45–63; F. Boldrer, 'Il bilinguismo di Cicerone: *scripta Graeca Latina* (*fam.* 15.4)', in R. Oniga (ed.), *Il plurilinguismo nella tradizione letteraria latina* (Rome, 2003), 131–50; S. Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung der eigenen Vergangenheit* (Cologne, etc., 2006); J. Tatum, 'The late republic', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 161–87, at 176–81.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Born into an equestrian family of Arpinum on 3 January 106 BC, Cicero enjoyed the best education Rome could provide, complemented later by a study visit to Athens and Rhodes (79–77 BC). During that visit he made (or renewed) the acquaintance of the philosopher and historian Posidonius, whom he may already have encountered during the latter's visit to Rome in 87 BC.[2] Thanks not least to his oratorical prowess and to the prestige and network of beneficiaries and friends it brought him, he enjoyed an uninterrupted rise through the *cursus honorum* (quaestor 75; plebeian aedile 69; praetor 66; consul 63), holding offices consistently at the minimum age, a remarkable achievement for a man without senatorial antecedents, and particularly notable given

[1] For full documentation see esp. M. Gelzer, *Cicero* (Wiesbaden, 1969).

[2] Acquaintance with Posidonius: Cic. *nat. deor.* 1.6; 1.123; 2.88; *fat.* 5; Plut. *Cic.* 4.5. Posidonius' visit: Plut. *Mar.* 45.7=*FGrHist* 87 F37; F255 Edelstein–Kidd.

that he had only the briefest military experience (under Cn. Pompeius Strabo and Sulla in the Social War).

As consul Cicero resolutely and successfully resisted what he saw as dangerous challenges to the established order, above all in his suppression of the conspiracy of Catiline, which was achieved at Rome by the arrest of five alleged leading conspirators and their execution on 5 December, after Cato had rallied the senate against Caesar's proposal of permanent imprisonment. His actions earned him a *supplicatio*, unprecedented for civilian services, and other honours. Cicero himself believed that he had not merely saved Rome in the short term: through the facing-down of dangerous popular proposals, the reinforcement of the authority of the senate, the new-found harmony between senate and *equites*, and more generally the unity of all 'good men' (essentially men of property) in defence of the status quo, he supposed he had created the conditions for a longer-term defence of the established order. By early 60, however, this edifice was, in his own eyes, virtually in ruins (*Att.* 1.18.2–3), and Cicero himself was under attack for executing citizens without trial (*fam.* 5.2.8; Dio 37.42.1–2), not least from his bitter enemy P. Clodius, who was already aiming at the tribunate, at least partly in order to call him to account (Schol. Bob. 85–6 St.; *Att.* 2.1.5). In 60/59 Cicero refused offers from Caesar that would have given him protection against Clodius, regarding the actions of Caesar, Pompey, Crassus, and their partisans in Caesar's consulship of 59 as negating the very concept of a *res publica*. As a result, in 58 Clodius was able, as tribune, to engineer Cicero's exile for the executions of 5 December 63, and publicly asserted that he had the support of Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus (*Sest.* 39). Others too alleged that Caesar had instigated Cicero's exile, and despite his public disclaimers Cicero surely believed such claims, as do the secondary sources (and many moderns).[3]

His banishment broke Cicero as a political force. Despite his recall in 57 and occasional shows of independence, he could exercise no major influence on events and turned to the composition of works on rhetoric and political philosophy. When civil war broke out in 49 he long wavered before joining Pompey, but after Pharsalus he returned to Italy and spent anxious months at Brundisium before receiving Caesar's pardon. Back in Rome, he again turned to literary composition, above all a series of philosophical works. This continued even after Caesar's murder. The murder itself he welcomed enthusiastically as the legitimate killing of a hated tyrant, but only in late 44 did he fully commit himself to political action against Mark Antony, whom he viewed as no less a threat to the *res publica*. His campaign, initially successful, foundered when Antony persuaded Lepidus and Octavian (and other Caesarians such as Pollio) to join forces against the supporters of Caesar's assassins: this Triumvirate issued proscriptions in early December 43, and Cicero was among their first victims (cf. Tiro 46 F3).

[3] Others: *prou.* 18; 43; *Pis.* 75. Cicero: *fam.* 14.2.2; *post red. in sen.* 32; *Sest.* 52; *leg.* 3.25; *Att.* 10.4.3; perhaps *fam.* 1.9.19–20 (both text and interpretation of *Att.* 2.22.5 are highly uncertain; in *Att.* 9.10.2 Pompey is deemed culpable; cf. Antony ap. *Att.* 10.8a.2); Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 245–6, 252–3. Secondary sources: Plut. *Cic.* 30.3–5; 31.3; *Caes.* 14.17; App. *b.c.* 2.14.53; Dio 38.10.4–12.3; 14.3; 14.7–17.3; 39.10.1–3; cf. Vell. 2.45.2.

Works

Cicero was not only the acknowledged master of Roman oratory. His poetic works, especially his translation of Aratus, exercised some influence on contemporary and later poets, he was an accomplished prose writer (if not always a profound thinker) who pioneered work in Latin on rhetoric, political theory, and philosophy, and his posthumously published letters also constituted an unprecedented contribution to Latin literature. Perhaps in 59, and certainly in 44, Atticus clearly urged him to the composition of history.[4] Plutarch (*Cic.* 41.1) claims that he intended to compile a full-scale account of Rome's past which would also have included some Greek history, and in the *De legibus* (1.5–10) Cicero represents both his brother Quintus and Atticus as pressing him to undertake a major historical work (cf. *Att.* 16.13a.2 (11 Nov. 44)). This last passage, together with Cicero's trenchant criticisms of earlier Roman historical writing and emphasis on historiography as a genre that required the qualities born of oratorical expertise (*de orat.* 2.51–2=GT1; *leg.* 1.5–7=GT2), leaves little doubt that he would have privately endorsed Nepos' view (fr.58 Marshall) that he was uniquely qualified to put Latin historiography on a par with that of Greece. Whether in fact he ever seriously contemplated the enterprise he elegantly declines in the *De legibus* is doubtful. What he actually wrote was limited in scope and scale.

Greek memoir on his consulship

The memoir was part of an (uncompleted) cycle of works planned by Cicero in early 60 BC on his consulship (T1) along with the collection and possibly publication of his major political speeches of 63 (*Att.* 2.1.3). The Latin poem *Consulatus* in three books was completed by the end of the year. There is no further trace of the Latin prose memoir; it was presumably never finished. Nonetheless, cumulatively this represents an unparalleled campaign of self-advertisement by a Roman political figure, presumably prompted in part by Cicero's status as a 'new man'. None had put together a comparable collection of their own speeches or commemorated their own deeds in verse, and although the exclusive focus of the Greek memoir on actions in high office was not unprecedented,[5] this was probably the first autobiographical work in which military exploits had not played a significant role, reflecting Cicero's own assessment (e.g. *off.* 1.76–7) that his actions in the civil sphere matched or even surpassed the greatest of military achievements.

Cicero uses *commentarius* of the Greek memoirs of himself (T1) and Atticus (T3.1 = Atticus 33 T2), whilst in T3.2 he refers to his own work by the corresponding Greek term ὑπόμνημα (implying that it occupied a single book). These are the first instances of these terms in Latin authors to denote a historical work. It is often supposed that Sulla entitled his autobiographical work *commentarii* (Plutarch regularly calls them ὑπομνήματα), but nothing demonstrates that (I. 284), and the

[4] Cic. *Att.* 2.12.3 (T9); 14.2 (59 BC); 14.14.5; 17.6; 16.13a(b).2 (44 BC).

[5] Cf. Q. Lutatius Catulus' memoir on his consulship and proconsulship (no. 19). The elder Cato's speech in defence of his actions as consul (*orat.* 21–55) also survived. On the unprecedented character of Cicero's corpus of speeches and of his autobiographical epics see Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 75–81, 162–3.

assumption that the term was generally used for earlier autobiographical works is unsupported by any evidence. Nor can we be certain that *ὑπόμνημα* appeared in the title of either Atticus' or Cicero's memoir.

The term *commentarius* may not, therefore, locate the work within a recognized Roman historiographical genre.[6] The root sense of *commentarius* is the preservation of information as an aid or supplement to memory; a similar sense attaches to *ὑπόμνημα*. Used of historical works *commentarius* usually (but not always[7]) denotes an account of the author's own experiences or of events at which they have been present and played at least a minor role. As such, it may implicitly differentiate the work in question from history proper (not least through its common but not universal focalization centred on the author[8]), while identifying itself as a means of preserving information for posterity and hence also for future historians.[9] This application of the term may derive from its use for the records kept by priests, magistrates, and private individuals,[10] but it does not justify the assumption that the *commentarius* as memoir is 'properly' an elaborated version of a magistrate's own record of his term of office.[11] Atticus' memoir was the work of a private individual, and we have no reason to suppose that either his or Cicero's *commentarius* was merely a reworking of the personal records and documents that Cicero had collected during his year of office, although Cicero at least presumably drew extensively on such material.

Use of the term *commentarius* also commonly suggests or reinforces an affectation of modest literary attainment.[12] Hence Cicero was evidently able to invite Posidonius to give the material of his own *commentarius* greater *ornatus* that he had done, and can suggest that Caesar's *commentarii* do not demonstrate the full literary embellishment (*ornatus*) normally associated with historical works (*Brut.* 262; cf. Hirtius *BGall.* 8 *praef.* 4). In fact, however, careful attention to style was essential in any work intended for publication, particularly one designed to advertise the author's own deeds, and suggestions that others might be able to rework one's material to greater literary effect constitute a topos whose primary function is to construct a self-effacing author, stress

[6] As e.g. G. Lieberg, *Prometheus* 28 (2002), 64–70 (against P. Scholz in P. Neukam (ed.), *Musa und Medien* (Munich, 1999), 82–97 (*non uidimus*)).

[7] Cf. Pliny *nat.* 13.87=Piso (9) F15; also Vitr. 7 *praef.* 1–2; the reference in Gell. 13.15.4 (Tuditanus 10 F2) is uncertain (cf. introduction to Tuditanus, no. 10).

[8] See esp. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 181; Scholz in Eigler *et al.* (eds.), *Formen RG* 176–7; 180. Atticus' memoir is an obvious exception.

[9] Cf. T3.2; Cic. *Brut.* 262; Hirtius *BGall.* 8 praef. 5 with (e.g.) J. Rüpke, *Gymnasium* 99 (1992), 204–6. So Parthenius represents his *Ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα* (*Narrationum amatoriarum libellus*) as a kind of *ὑπομνημάτιον* from which Gallus can select poetic subjects (*praef.* 2 with J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford, 1999), 217–19, 263–4). *Commentarii* or *ὑπομνήματα* could also be provided privately to historians as raw material based on the author's own knowledge of the events the historian was to narrate: Cic. *fam.* 5.12.10; Fronto 108; Eunapius F8 (Müller, *FHG* 4.15–16=F15 Blockley); G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1956), 97–9. It is most improbable, however, that this was in fact the sole or most important purpose of published memoirs, even those termed *commentarii* (cf. F. Börner, *Hermes* 81 (1953), 239–40; Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 181–2).

[10] A. von Premerstein, *RE* 4. 758–9; F. Börner, *Hermes* 81 (1953), esp. 212–15, 226–30.

[11] As by implication Börner, *Hermes* 81 (1953), 210–50; cf. e.g. Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 633–8.

[12] As may *ὑπόμνημα* (cf. esp. Lucian *hist. conscr.* 16; D. Ambaglio, *Athenaeum* 68 (1990), 504–7; see also T. Dorandi, *Le Stylet et la tablette* (Paris, 2000), 77–101), although it may also be used of major historical works such as those of Polybius or Strabo (M. Durst, *RQ-I* 84 (1989), 316; Ambaglio, *Athenaeum* 68 (1990), 503–5; J. Engels, *ZPE* 96 (1993), 26).

the priority given to presentation of the facts rather than their elaboration, and compliment the addressee; it is not necessarily to be taken at face value.[13] Cicero acknowledges the highly polished nature of his own memoir,[14] barely conceals his disappointment at the much simpler style adopted by Atticus, and justifies the latter not by the demands of the *commentarius* form but by its inherent effectiveness (significantly it is Cicero, not Atticus, who feels able to be more Greek than the Greeks). So far as works of this type did avoid high style, that was perhaps increasingly a deliberate choice, designed primarily to enhance the impression of objectivity, especially in the recital of one's own achievements, and perhaps in some cases to claim for the work an authoritative status comparable to that of sub-literary *commentarii*.[15]

The increasing weakness of his political position and the attacks on his conduct as consul must have influenced Cicero's presentation of his actions in the memoir. However, short-term self-defence was hardly the major purpose of the work: Cicero's fortunes at Rome would be determined by politics, not literary self-justification. As Cicero himself implies (T3), immediate fame was a vital consideration (cf. later *fam.* 5.12.1; 9). Written in Greek, his work was clearly intended for general dissemination throughout the Mediterranean world (cf. T3; Cic. *Arch.* 23), perhaps partly in implicit response to Theophanes' account of Pompey's successes in the East, and Cicero's vanity was still touched some nine years later by the awed respect that the events of 63 generated in Cilicia (*fam.* 2.10.2; cf. also Plut. *Cic.* 32.5). At the same time, his posthumous fame, a matter of significant personal concern (*Att.* 2.5.1; 17.2; cf. *Cat.* 3.26), and the need to ensure that his interpretation of his achievements became canonical in later historical writing were surely also salient factors. Both preoccupations presumably lay behind his abortive proposal that Posidonius use the memoir as the basis of his own account.[16] Rivalry with Pompey was no doubt a particular spur,[17] and Cicero will have found personal pleasure (and a reinforcement

[13] Cf. already Sulla 22 F1 with G. Pascucci, *StudUrb (B)* 49.1 (1975), 294–6; P. Scholz in *Formen RG*, 189–190 n. 65. Isocr. *or.* 5.85 provides an early example (Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift* (cit. n. 9), 103). See also Parth. *amat.narr.*, *praef.* 2 with M. Biraud, D. Voisin, A. Zucker, *Parthénios de Nicée: Passions d'amour* (Grenoble, 2008), 79–81; T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces* (Stockholm, 1964), 51–2, 124–161, esp. 151–2; T. Baier in M. Reichel (ed.), *Antike Autobiographien* (Vienna, 2005), 139–40; P. V. Cova, *Athenaeum* 96 (2008), 815. Writers on technical subjects often employ a similar strategy (Janson o.c. 99–100; T. Fögen in M. Horster, C. Reitz (eds.), *Antike Fachschriftsteller: Literarischer Diskurs und sozialer Kontext* (Wiesbaden, 2003), 36, 40–2).

[14] On the implications of the references to Isocrates and Aristotle in T3.1 see Shackleton Bailey ad loc.; Boldrer in Oniga (ed.), *Plurilinguismo* (2003), 140–1. On the self-deprecating cosmetic imagery (with its potential overtones of falsity and effeminacy) see Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 3–7.

[15] Cf. A. Riggsby, *Caesar in Gaul and Rome* (Austin, Tex., 2006), 149–50.

[16] Even if both Cicero and Posidonius are engaged in a sophisticated game of *politesse* (C. B. R. Pelling in M. Wyke (ed.), *Julius Caesar in Western Culture* (Oxford, 2006), 17), Cicero had much to gain (as perhaps Rutilius Rufus (21) had already done: I. 280) if Posidonius took up his invitation. On the possible motivation of Posidonius' refusal see M. Laffranque, *RPhilos* 152 (1962), 355; I. G. Kidd, *Posidonius* 2.1 (Cambridge, 1988), 27; but note also C. B. R. Pelling in B. McGing, J. Mossman (eds.), *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea, 2006), 270 n. 3. J. Malitz, *Die Historien des Poseidonios* (Munich, 1983), 28 n. 189, detects a possible fragment of Posidonius' reply in Cic. *off.* 3.10.

[17] Cf. Malitz, o.c. 27–8 with bibliography; Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 61–2, 85–9, 178, 242 n. 487, 284. Cicero had already drawn a parallel between his own achievements at home and those of Pompey in the East (*Cat.* 3.26; cf. *Cat.* 4.21; *har. resp.* 49; *Att.* 6.1.22), and later confesses his mortification that Pompey's future fame might eclipse his own (*Att.* 2.17.2).

of his convictions) in reliving the glories of 63 (cf. *Att.* 2.23.3) whose lustre was fast fading and, in the eyes of some, irremediably tarnished.

In his memoir Cicero presumably found ways of emphasizing that his own preservation of the republic at home matched Pompey's expansion of the empire abroad, not least through his established practice of representing himself as a 'general in a toga' (*dux togatus*).[18] Beyond this, F1 shows that Crassus' patriotism was highlighted: a powerful politician, who had so recently eulogized Cicero's consulship (*Att.* 1.14.3), was not to be offended gratuitously. That will also partly explain the omission of the threatened assault on Caesar by the *equites* who guarded the senate on the Nones of December (Plut. *Caes.* 8.4=T5), if that was not a later fabrication.[19] However, surrounding the senate with armed men who threatened individual senators was itself controversial and the subject of bitter criticism later (e.g. *Sest.* 28; *Phil.* 2.16); it was a topic perhaps best avoided in the consul's own interest.

Further assistance in determining the character and content of the ὑπόμνημα has often been sought in the extant accounts that may have drawn on it, notably Plutarch and Dio.[20] Both authors certainly knew (of) the work. Plutarch cites it twice, in the *Crassus* (13.4=T12, F1) and the *Caesar* (8.4=T5), almost certainly at first hand.[21] If so, he would surely also have made considerable use of it in the *Cicero*. A detailed narrative of the episode he ascribes to it in *Crass.* 13.4 certainly appears there (*Cic.* 15.1–4; see F1 comm.). The memoir is also almost certainly the target of Calenus' mockery in his attack on Cicero in Dio 46.21.3–4 (T6). Dio's language clearly points to a prose work, not the *Consulatus*,[22] and the memoir on the consulship is the most obvious target of his initial reference to Cicero's account of the events of 63. Although Calenus' subsequent ridicule of a history of Rome written backwards from 63 BC to Romulus might allude to a separate work, that corresponds to nothing that Cicero in fact wrote and more probably reflects, in grossly exaggerated terms, Cicero's ploy of comparing his own achievements to those of the great Romans of the past and, at least implicitly, of comparing himself to Rome's founder.[23]

[18] e.g. *Cat.* 2.28; 3.15; 3.23; 4.5; C. Nicolet, *REL* 38 (1960), 240–52; J. Graff, *Ciceros Selbstauffassung* (Heidelberg, 1963), 27, 29; cf. 30 with n. 42; Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 177, 183 n. 666; cf. C. E. Steel, *Cicero, Rhetoric and Empire* (Oxford, 2001), 166–73; A. Dyck, *HSCPh* 102 (2004), 305–11.

[19] As Münzer, *RE* 2A. 865; cf. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt*, 124–5. That Cicero in 60 was concerned with criticism that he had prevented Caesar's lynching (Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 48, 52–3, 67–8) is most unlikely.

[20] e.g. Weizsäcker, *JbKPh* 111 (1875), esp. 422–8; Thouret, *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 306–18; Schmidt, *De Ciceronis commentario* (1884), 5–43 (overplayed); Peter 2. xi–xii; O. Lendle, *Hermes* 95 (1967), 94–109; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 46–9. Further bibliography in B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs* (Munich, 1979), 115–16; Pelling, o.c. 59 n. 1.

[21] Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 47–8.

[22] As e.g. A. Traglia, *Marco Tullio Cicerone, I frammenti poetici* (Milan, 1962), 38. The parallel with (Sall.) *inu. in Cic.* 6 (E. Gabba, *RSI* 69 (1957), 320) is insufficiently close to prove otherwise. The *consilia* can be ruled out, since according to Dio himself (T14) that work remained concealed until after Cicero's death. For the suggestion that Calenus was referring to the full history projected at *leg.* 1.8 but never actually written, see e.g. T. Zielinksi, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (4th edn., Leipzig, 1929), 285; Garbarino, 20; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 412.

[23] Past Romans: *Cat.* 4.21; *Sull.* 22–3; cf. A. Vasaly, *Representations* (Berkeley, 1993), 62–8, 80. Romulus: Cic. *Cat.* 1.33; 3.2; *consulatus* F8 Courtney; [Sall.] *inu. in Cic.* 7; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 49.1; Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 179–80; Vasaly, o.c. 40–87; E. A. Schmidt in id. (ed.), *L'Histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine* (Vandoeuvres–Geneva, 2001), 99–100; Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 91 n. 89, 114 n. 188, 114 n. 192; cf. Jacoby *FGrHist* 235 F3 comm. The tactic was echoed and endorsed by the declaimer Capito: Sen. *contr.* 7.2.6–7.

Presumably that occupied a place of honour in the memoir too and was developed at some length.

The supposition that in the accounts of 63 Plutarch and Dio draw on a common source and that this is the memoir rests on similarities between their accounts in terms of chronology and narrative organization and progression, on their strongly Ciceronian perspective, on extensive parallels with material and motifs from Cicero's surviving works, and on other material that can be plausibly assigned a Ciceronian origin.[24] However, there are elements in both authors that cannot derive from the memoir (e.g. their characterization of Cicero's colleague C. Antonius) or clearly come from other sources, as well as disagreements between them (notably over the dating of the inception of the Catilinarian conspiracy proper) and a surprising lack of verbal parallels if both are drawing directly on the same Greek source.[25] Moreover, both authors clearly elaborate and modify their material to suit their own objectives[26] and both omit or attribute only secondary importance to what Cicero had recently paraded as key achievements of his consulship (*Att.* 1.14.4 (61 BC)): low grain prices, the establishment of the senate's authority, the political consensus of Italy, and above all the 'concord of the orders'. None of this excludes use of the memoir, but if so, it implies that both accounts are heavily reworked versions of the Ciceronian material, although some items that they share may well derive from Cicero's memoir—such as the use of omens to intensify the depth of the crisis (Plut. *Cic.* 14.4; Dio 37.25.2; cf. Cic. *diu.* 1.18–19=*consulatus* F10.11–32 Courtney) or the Bona Dea portent (F2 comm.).

Most of the material common to Plutarch and Dio also appears in Cicero's surviving works and tends to confirm that the memoir rehearsed the now familiar themes of his consulship. Plutarch and Dio link Cicero's resistance to popular demands in the early part of the year with the exposure and suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy in the later months. Cicero probably did the same and thus gave a coherent shape to his own actions and to the memoir itself (cf. *fam.* 5.12.2–5 for the singularity of focus of the monograph as facilitating thematic and dramatic coherence as well as a greater *ornatio* in general). He later claimed (*fam.* 1.9.12) that from 1 January he had stiffened the resolve of the senate and had thus given it the necessary strength of purpose to take decisive action on 5 December. No doubt in the memoir, as e.g. in *Pis.* 4–7, he described how his resolute conduct throughout the year had reinforced the established order and, in particular, the senate's authority.

Autobiographical writing brought its author particular problems of credible self-presentation, as Cicero was aware (*fam.* 5.12.8). That is also implicit in his emphasis to Atticus in T1 that the memoir was a work of history rather than an encomium, such as might be justified by a plea of self-defence against the attacks of his enemies and

[24] e.g. the calming of the demonstration against Otho (Plut. *Cic.* 13.2–4) or Cicero's announcement in the Forum and escort home on the Nones of December (*Cic.* 22.4–7).

[25] Other sources: see (with reservations) e.g. Schliephacke, *Programm Goslar* 1877, 31–7 (Dio); Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 46–9 (Plutarch). Dating: contrast Plut. *Cic.* 10.1–11.2 and Dio 37.29.1–30.5. Potentially significant verbal parallels are restricted to Plut. *Cic.* 14.7–8; Dio 37.29.3–5 (Cicero at the elections in 63).

[26] Cf. Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 53–9 (Plutarch); G. Huber, *Untersuchungen zu Caesars Oberpontifikat* (diss. Tübingen, 1971), 14–17; A. Drummond, *Athenaeum* 87 (1999), 148–53 (Dio).

detractors. A range of narrative strategies was available to meet the problem,[27] and Cicero probably employed some or all of them, including perhaps the adoption of a third person narrative mode to create a greater sense of objectivity.[28] He may have dedicated the work to Posidonius with a self-effacing preface purporting simply to provide facts for Posidonius to adorn.[29] He may well also have affected modesty by emphasizing the role of the gods in preserving Rome (as in *Cat.* 3.22; *Att.* 1.16.6) whilst claiming divine endorsement and encouragement of his actions (both major features of the *consulatus*), thus implicitly enhancing the significance of his own role and achievements.[30] He will certainly have praised the part played by others besides himself. At the personal level that probably included Terentia (F2) and Nigidius Figulus (F3). At the political level he must have emphasized (and exaggerated) the widespread support he enjoyed among the populace at large as well as among the senate and *equites* (cf. e.g. *Cat.* 4.14–16): as often elsewhere, the courage of the senate in particular will have featured alongside the providence of the gods as a means of softening the sense of exorbitant self-eulogy (cf. Quint. *inst.* 11.1.23–4; also Plut. *mor.* 542B–C). Individuals were again also presumably highlighted in such contexts, certainly Cato: the allusion to his Greek praises of Cato in *fam.* 15.4 (T4) can only refer to the memoir,[31] which must have emphasized Cato's courageous contribution to the debate of the Nones of December in particular (as in *Sest.* 61). As in his dialogues (Quint. *inst.* 11.1.21), Cicero will also have used the actions and words of others as a less invidious form of self-eulogy, not least to emphasize the general acclamation of his preservation of Rome against his would-be detractors (cf. e.g. *Pis.* 6–7). Plutarch's account of his triumphal return home on the Nones of December (*Cic.* 22.5–7), with its exaltation of Cicero's civil achievements over those of military triumphators, fits that agenda precisely and its attribution to the memoir is extremely attractive.[32] Finally, Cicero's rhetorical fireworks, matching the scale and significance of his achievements in his own estimation, must have been deployed first and foremost to highlight the threats that Rome faced from subversive forces in 63, which in turn underlined the personal dangers that he faced and his resourcefulness, courage and sagacity in overcoming them.

[27] Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 205–16. On the engagement of rhetoric with the topic of self-praise see L. Radermacher, *RhM* 52 (1897), 419–24; cf. also Marincola, o.c. 175–9.

[28] If *timebat* in *Consulatus* F9 Courtney refers to Cicero himself (as e.g. Courtney ad loc.; cf. also Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 82), that work was written in the third person, making it likely that the same was true of the *ὑπόμνημα*, although earlier autobiographical works seem to have adopted the first person (Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 196).

[29] Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 54–5, although it is then odd that Cicero should repeat much of this information to Atticus, who had already seen the work itself (T3), and Cicero himself had evidently given copies to other potential Greek eulogists (T2).

[30] F2 comm.; cf. also Dio 37.34.3–4 with Cic. *Cat.* 3.18–21; Cic. *div.* 1.19–21=*consulatus* F10.33–65 Courtney; M. Hose, *Hermes* 123 (1995), 464–7; Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 53–4.

[31] Boldrer in Oniga (ed.), *Plurilinguismo* (2003), 146–9.

[32] So e.g. C. Habicht, *Cicero the Politician* (Baltimore, 1990), 32–4. Cf. Cicero's similar construction of his return from exile: *Att.* 4.1.4–5; *dom.* 75–6; *Sest.* 131; *Pis.* 35; 51–2; T. Itgenhorst, *Tota illa pompa: der Triumph in der römischen Republik* (Göttingen, 2005), 79–80. The immediately preceding motif in Plut. *Cic.* 22.4, of the Forum thronged with Catilinarian sympathizers, also finds a parallel in Cicero's later rhetoric, designed to establish continuity between his defeat of the Catilinarians in 63 and subsequent confrontations with populist agitators (see esp. *Sull.* 28; *dom.* 63; *parad. Stoic.* 27).

It is plausible to suppose that Sallust consulted the memoir before writing his *Catiline*.[33] It was the most obvious source of a narrative base and Sallust's general endorsement of, and probable reliance on, Cicero's account of the conspiracy is clear. However, no specific debts to the memoir can be identified and Sallust's own evaluation of Cicero's role and achievement differed significantly from that of Cicero himself. There is no trace of the memoir in later Latin sources, and though it may well have been used by Livy, for example, Sallust's monograph was a powerful competitor as a source for Catiline's conspiracy.

Consilia[34]

Dio (T14) and perhaps Fronto (T13),[35] together with F4–6, attest a single book in Latin by Cicero setting out and justifying his policies, and including virulent accusations against Crassus and Caesar. Plutarch (T12, F7) almost certainly refers to this same work (comm. on F7). It is often further identified with the ἀνέκδοτα Cicero was planning to write in April 59 (T7) on the grounds that this too was not intended for general circulation, that its fierce 'Theopompan' character suggests criticism of powerful individuals,[36] and that ἀνέκδοτα implies information not in the public domain,[37] highly suitable for a work revealing the secret machinations of Crassus and Caesar. If so, it will be the work of history to which Cicero is devoting himself in two later letters that month (T8–9). The recurrence of the term ἀνέκδοτον in T11 (its only other appearance in extant Latin literature according to Garbarino, 26) raises the possibility that this was also the work that Cicero was polishing up in May 44,[38] especially as the context here suggests a work critical of Caesar and covering the earlier part of his career.[39] That identification would be further supported if we accepted Harnecker's plausible suggestion that this is also the secret work to which even Cicero cannot now return in *Brut.* 16 (T10: 46 BC).[40]

With its emphasis on Crassus (see F4 on the alleged conspiracy of 65), the *Consilia* seems to have been written from the perspective of the early 50s rather than the period after Caesar's death, when Cicero would surely have focused more strongly on Caesar and his supposed pursuit of *regnum*. Dio (T14) dates the composition after Cicero's return from exile in 57 BC. That is not incompatible with T7 if Shackleton

[33] So e.g. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897), 581; Peter 2. xii–xiii; Syme, *Sallust*, 73.

[34] Modern texts consistently cite the work as *De consiliis suis* ('On his Own Policies') but neither Dio (T14) nor Boethius (F6b) shows that this was the title. As with the *Consulatus* (H. D. Jocelyn, *Ciceroniana* 5 (1984), 40), the title may have been *Consilia*, or perhaps *Ratio* (or *Expositio*) *consiliorum suorum* (F5; cf. F6a; Cic. *fam.* 1.9.4).

[35] The reading in T13 derives from Hauler's unpublished notes (discarding his earlier supposition that Fronto referred to a similar work of Asinius Pollio) but is very uncertain: see M. P. J. van den Hout, *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae* (Leipzig, 1988), lxxviii; *Comm.* 299.

[36] For this as a frequently noted characteristic of Theopompus' work cf. Pol. 8.9.1–10.1; Cic. *Hort.* 15 Grilli (Theopompus unsurpassed in acerbity); Nepos *Alc.* 11.1; DH *ad Pomp.* 6.7–8; Plut. *Lys.* 30.2; Lucian *hist. conscr.* 59.

[37] Cf. R. Hirzel, *RhM* 47 (1892), 369 n. 1.

[38] For the standard assumption that T7, 8, 9, and 11 all refer to our work see e.g. R. Hirzel, *RhM* 47 (1892), 368 n. 2; Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897), 557; Peter 2. v–vi; Schanz–Hosius 1[4]. 533; Büchner, *RE* 7A. 1267–8; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 408. For reservations see Garbarino 25–7.

[39] Cf. Atticus' exhortation to Cicero a few days earlier to write a history that would expose the villainies of the Caesarians (*Att.* 14.14.5); Büchner, *RE* 7A. 1267–8.

[40] O. Harnecker, *JbKPh* 123 (1881), 184–5; cf. Douglas on Cic. *Brut.* 16; Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 408–9.

Bailey's justified obelization of *scribendi* in that passage is accepted.[41] However, Dio's dating may simply be his own attempt to provide a plausible context for an attack on Crassus and Caesar whom he has just identified as responsible for Cicero's exile.[42] Certainly he errs in supposing that Cicero at that point entrusted the work to his 8-year-old son, and there are difficulties in assuming that the son published it after his father's death.[43] If Plutarch refers to our work in F7 (T12), he clearly implies that it was published after the deaths of Crassus and Caesar, leaving open the possibility that Cicero himself put it into circulation.[44]

Whatever its precise form, the work's novel title clearly indicated its focus on Cicero's policies and their execution. If the letters of April 59 concern our work, they show that Cicero himself prospectively categorized it as a work of history. Whether in fact it was properly such, however, is less certain. Admittedly, it may well have had a strong narrative element and a broadly chronological framework; it may also have included speeches if F6 derives from such a context; and *consilia* were long recognized as a proper concern of historiography.[45] However, Cicero's work differed from the norm in its professed focus on the author's own policies and exclusive concern with internal politics; and if F6 derives from Cicero's own account rather than a speech, its elaborate simile and employment of prose rhythm is alien to normal historiographical practice. The *Consilia* may not then have been a work of historiography in the usual sense and perhaps drew on more than one genre.

For ancient critics the polemical nature of the work attracted most attention, but that may be misleading. No doubt, as Dio in particular implies, self-justification was also a significant preoccupation. If, for example, Cicero accused Crassus and Caesar of implication in the Catilinarian conspiracy, it was necessary to explain why he had taken no action against them in 63 (cf. perhaps Plut. *Cic.* 20.6–7; *Caes.* 8.4). Yet if Fronto refers to our work, his language suggests that Cicero actively paraded his policies in an expansive manner and high literary style.[46] Such an approach is certainly exemplified in F6, which also perhaps suggests that the work claimed a didactic purpose, regardless of whether it expresses the author's own reflections or derives from a speech incorporated within the work.[47] That is readily intelligible if the *Consilia* set out in Cicero's own person the proper objectives of the statesman and the means by which these were to be achieved and also exposed the moral and political

[41] Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 1. 364. Cicero seems here and in T9 (also *Att.* 2.14.2) to refer to a work yet to be written and the verbal echo of πολιτευτέον in πολιτεύομαι suggests that in the sentence *nec quid aliud iam* etc. ('Not that I now engage, etc.') Cicero is no longer talking of the ἀνέκδοτα but reverts to his earlier thoughts on political engagement.

[42] Dio 39.10.1–2; cf. 38.10.4–12.3; 14.3; 14.7–17.3; L. Havas, *ACD* 6 (1970), 37.

[43] Syme, *Sallust*, 63.

[44] So e.g. Büchner, *RE* 7A. 1267–8 (but the work Cicero promises to polish and send to Atticus in *Att.* 16.11.3 may be the *Laelius* or *Topica* rather than the *Consilia*: cf. Garbarino, 26 n. 64).

[45] See e.g. Pol. 3.31.11–13; 10.21.8; Sempronius Asellio 20 F1–2. For Cicero himself cf. *fam.* 5.12.4; 6; 9; *de orat.* 2.63.

[46] So too *pangentur* ('pen') in T7 (cf. also *Att.* 2.14.2) ironically implies grand pretensions for the work planned in 59 (cf. C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry* 2 (Cambridge, 1971), 399–400).

[47] For the importance of leaving behind a representation of one's *consilia* and *virtutes* in suitably artistic form see esp. Cic. *Arch.* 30. Sulla's memoirs had included at least one piece of advice to its dedicatee (22 F14ab = Plut. *Sull.* 6.10; *Luc.* 23.6).

factors that had progressively frustrated and undermined those objectives.[48] If T7 refers to our work and identifies its 'Theopompan' character, that too will be relevant here. For Theopompus was seen as containing a strong didactic element and in particular as revealing the hidden factors in historical developments (DH *ad Pomp.* 6.4–8), while his fierce criticism of individuals and communities, or particular social groups such as the young (e.g. *FGrHist* 115 F213), had a strong moral basis and served as a primary explanation of political weakness and disorder, a thesis highly congenial to Cicero.[49]

The scope of the *Consilia* is unknown. Although his consulship was the period in which Cicero's *consilia* were (in his view) crucial to the preservation of the state (e.g. *Sull.* 33; *dom.* 93; *Mil.* 36; *off.* 1.77; Kurczyk, *Cicero und die Inszenierung* (2006), 175; 331 n. 175), the work may well have covered the subsequent years, particularly if the events of 60/59 were the major spur to its composition: Cicero's *consilia* in his confrontation with Clodius, subsequent withdrawal from Rome and Italy, and triumphant return from exile might form an effective complement and counterpart to those employed in his consulship (cf. e.g. *dom.* 145), and T11 may imply that Atticus in 44 proposed a (further) extension of the work down to Caesar's dictatorship, a suggestion that Cicero did not take up. The letters of April 59 clearly imply that the work then envisaged would include contemporary political developments: that must lie behind Cicero's request (T8) that Atticus inform him of 'anything worthy of inclusion in a historical narrative' and Atticus' observation on the accumulation of suitable material cited in T9.[50] A wider scope for the work than the consulship would also give greater latitude for Cicero's criticisms of others beside Crassus and Caesar (T14). No doubt *populares* of all kinds were targeted, not least those such as Metellus Nepos who had attacked Cicero himself. If the work went beyond 63, Clodius and his comrades would be included. The letters are critical too of Cato and Pompey, but here Cicero may have been more muted. If he claimed Theopompus as in some sense a model, that does not imply that his critique was deliberately and consciously biased.[51] However, Rawson's attempt to acquit Cicero of the worst excesses in the charges levelled at Crassus and Caesar fails (see comm. on F4 and F7). Nor is it a sufficient defence to suppose that he honestly believed his accusations, particularly of complicity with Catiline. Nothing absolves Cicero of the failure to exercise an impartial and critical scrutiny of the evidence or of the suppression of

[48] Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 188–9 with P. Scholz in *Formen RG* 188–9 on Cicero's view of the link between (auto)biography and political education. As a work of political instruction it might appropriately be dedicated to Cicero's son, as was the *De officiis* of 44 BC (*Att.* 15.13a.2; *off.* 1.1), and such a dedication may lie behind Dio's (garbled) statement in T14. Such an ostensibly didactic character might also explain the rhythmical nature of the prose (if F6 is characteristic of the work as a whole) and have been reinforced by the use of the authorial voice (cf. comm. on F6). It would also help to justify the self-laudatory character of the work (cf. Plut. *mor.* 544D).

[49] Theopompus: see esp. M. A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios* (Oxford, 1994), 63–83. Cicero: e.g. *Consulatus* F6–7; 10.30–5 Courtney; T. N. Mitchell, *Hermathena* 136 (1984), 25–34 (29 with n. 20 documents Cicero's attacks on the licence of the young).

[50] For the suggestion that Dio dated the composition of the work to 57 because that was its terminal date see Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897), 559.

[51] See E. Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 411.

material that did not suit his own presuppositions.[52] An implicit acknowledgement and expression of political impotence, the *Consilia* was a flagrantly partisan work.

Its later influence is uncertain. Sallust may have used it, though the supposition that the *Catiline* was written specifically to refute it has long been discredited.[53] Asconius may have employed it beyond the explicit citation in F4, but identifying the relevant passages is inevitably conjectural.[54] Plutarch may have known the work at first hand, but his vague allusion to it (T12) does not inspire confidence and makes it questionable whether we could safely attribute to it (e.g.) the role given to Caesar in agitation against Cicero in late 63/early 62 in *Cic.* 23.[55] Dio's muddled reference to it appears derivative, and the citations in Augustine and Boethius must also come from an intermediary source (comm. on F6).

(AD)

[52] Plut. *Crass.* 13.4 (T12) clearly implies that Crassus' delivery of the warning letters from the conspirators did not feature in the *Consilia*.

[53] Syme, *Sallust*, 64, 127.

[54] e.g. Ascon. *Mil.* 43St=50C on Clodius almost joining Catiline. Other conjectures in C. Lichtenfeldt, *De Q. Asconii Pediani fontibus ac fide* (Breslau, 1888), 19–23.

[55] Cf. H. Strasburger, *Ciceros philosophisches Spätwerk* (Hildesheim, 1990), 5 with n. 19.

40

C. Oppius

Editions: Peter 2. lxiii–lxiv, 46–9.

Principal discussions: G. Thouret, 'De Cicerone, Asinio Pollione, C. Oppio rerum Caesarianarum scriptoribus', *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 305–60, esp. 346–60; Schanz–Hosius I[4] (1927), 350–1; Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt* (1938), 30–3; F. Münzer, 'C. Oppius (9)', *RE* 18 (1939), 729–36; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 271; B. Baldwin, *Suetonius* (Amsterdam, 1983), 116–18; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos* (1985), 83–4; G. B. Townend, 'C. Oppius on Julius Caesar', *AJPh* 108 (1987), 325–42.

INTRODUCTION

Life

C. Oppius was a close friend and adviser of Julius Caesar. Under the dictatorship he managed Caesar's affairs in his absence, together with L. Cornelius Balbus. The relationship between Caesar and Oppius can be traced back some years earlier (perhaps to 61 BC) through a series of anecdotes in Plutarch and Suetonius,[1] but of his early life and background we know virtually nothing (other than the possibility that he came from Spoletium[2]). In spite of his power and influence he remains a surprisingly obscure figure.[3]

By the mid-50s he was active on Caesar's behalf in Rome; and as early as 54 he worked with Cicero to buy land beside the Forum and in the Campus Martius for Caesar's planned building projects (Cic. *Att.* 4.16.8). He was always on good terms with Cicero (note especially *fam.* 11.29.2), and appears frequently in his correspondence, where he is often named together with Balbus. At the start of the civil war in 49 Oppius and Balbus tried to work for a negotiated peace and to engage Cicero in the process;[4] two letters to them from Caesar are preserved at Cic. *Att.* 9.7c and 9.13c, the first of them a propaganda statement designed for public consumption, according

[1] Plut. *Caes.* 17.11 and Suet. *Iul.* 72 both tell the story of how Caesar gave up to Oppius the only room in a poor man's hut where they were forced to shelter during a journey through difficult country. This will have occurred either in 61, on the way to Spain, or in 58 en route to Gaul. The episodes reported in F7 and F8, of which Oppius was no doubt an eyewitness, are likely to belong in the same context.

[2] *CIL* 11. 4812 may refer to him (Münzer, *RE* 18. 731; C. Nicolet, *L'Ordre équestre* 2 (Paris, 1974), 964).

[3] According to Syme, 'Oppius lacks colour beside the formidable Balbus' (*RR* 72), while Münzer, after noting the few known facts about him, observes 'sonst ist über seine Persönlichkeit, Herkunft, Verwandtschaft, Entwicklung und Lebensgeschichte nichts zu ermitteln' (*RE* 18. 730). For an assessment of his role in the power politics of the 50s and 40s see A. Alföldi, *Oktavians Aufstieg zur Macht* (Bonn, 1976), 31–5, 43–54.

[4] They also sought Cicero's advice and, in recognition of his friendship with both Caesar and Pompey, urged him to remain neutral. Years later, in the only surviving letter to Oppius, Cicero thanked him for his understanding attitude (*fam.* 11.29.2).

to Syme.[5] Oppius interceded with Caesar on Cicero's behalf after Pharsalus (e.g. *Att.* 11.6.3, 7.5, 8.1), and in the following years he and Balbus became Caesar's principal agents, and a means of access to his favour and patronage (Cic. *Att.* 11.18.1–2; 12.13.2, 19.2, 29.2; *fam.* 6.19.2; 9.6.1); Cicero noted in December 46 that Caesar habitually ratified whatever Oppius and Balbus had done in his absence (*fam.* 6.8.1), and Tacitus describes them as the first *equites* powerful enough to decide on war and peace by themselves (*ann.* 12.60.6). Although Balbus went on to hold the consulship in 40 BC, Oppius never held public office. Cicero hints that a magistracy was being prepared for him in 49 (*fam.* 2.16.7), but he evidently declined the honour.[6]

In the immediate aftermath of Caesar's death, Oppius steered a middle course, remaining on good terms with Cicero (who praised his self-restraint in a letter to Atticus on 7 April: *Att.* 14.1.1), but later in the year was working for Octavian and trying to win Cicero's support for the Caesarian cause (*Att.* 16.15.3). That is the last we hear of him, and it is possible that he died soon after; but the argument from silence is weak in this instance,[7] and it is possible, as Münzer argued, that he lived on to the time of Actium or even beyond. The fact that he wrote a life of Cassius (F4, and see below) would in any case suggest that he lived for some time after Philippi; but Münzer's case rests mainly on the fact that Oppius issued, on Octavian's behalf, a written challenge to Antony's claim that Ptolemy Caesarion was Caesar's son (Suet. *Iul.* 52.2 = T3); this could have happened in 44, but Münzer persuasively argued that a better context would be the propaganda war that broke out in 32, in which the paternity of Caesarion was one of the most contested issues.[8]

Works

Oppius is known to have published a number of works in addition to the refutation of the claims of Caesarion. We learn from Suetonius (T4) that he was thought by some to have been the author of the accounts of Caesar's African, Alexandrian, and Spanish campaigns, a view that is universally rejected by modern scholars.[9] As Münzer saw, the explanation for this attribution must be that Oppius was known to have written a work on Caesar, a work to which at least some of the surviving fragments must be assigned. Whether this work, for which no title is preserved, was a full biography, or some other sort of memoir, is a matter of dispute, and Münzer himself was unable to decide.[10]

Other works for which we have evidence and, it appears, titles, include lives of the elder Scipio Africanus (F1–3) and of Cassius (F4). One fragment could be from a life

[5] Syme, *RR* 159. For secret messages Caesar used code (Suet. *Iul.* 56.6); Gellius (17.9.1–5) knew of a corpus of such letters to Oppius and Balbus.

[6] Nicolet, *L'Ordre équestre* 1 (Paris, 1966), 710.

[7] Almost everything we know about Oppius comes from Cicero's correspondence, especially the letters to Atticus (some thirty-five references, as opposed to five in the *ad fam.*), the latest of which (*Att.* 16.15, which mentions Oppius!) dates from November 44.

[8] Dio 49.41.1–4; 50.1.5; 50.3.5. Münzer, *RE* 18. 734; cf. Syme, *RR* 277.

[9] Discussions of this question include L. W. Daly, *CW* 44 (1951), 113–17; L. Canali, *Maia* 18 (1966), 115–37; L. Canfora, *Belfagor* 25 (1970), 419–29; E. Koestermann, *Historia* 22 (1973), 48–63; R. H. Storch, *AClass* 20 (1977), 201–4; A. Patzer, *WJA* 19 (1993), 111–30; I. G. H. Hall, *CQ* 46 (1996), 411–15; R. Cluett, in F. Cairns, E. Fantham (eds.), *Caesar against Liberty?* (Cambridge, 2003), 118–31.

[10] Münzer, *RE* 18. 735.

of Marius (F5), and another from a life of Pompey (F6), although neither is explicitly assigned as such by its citing authority (Pliny and Plutarch respectively). The two remaining fragments (7–8) are also unassigned, but both concern Caesar. Peter wanted to assign all the fragments to the same work, a discursive memoir of Caesar that included passages on his ancestry and background (hence Marius), and comparisons with earlier generals (Scipio) and contemporary rivals (Pompey). As for Cassius, Peter contemplated emending *de uita Cassii* to *de uita Caesaris*.[11] But this seems a drastic and unnecessary revision of a body of evidence that seems at first sight to indicate something quite different, namely a series of named biographies. Strasburger suggested a work *de uiris illustribus*, similar perhaps to that of Hyginus (no. 63), who is cited together with Oppius in F2, in which contemporaries were divided between political friends and enemies, with Marius and Caesar in the former group, Pompey and Cassius in the latter.[12] That Oppius was not necessarily to be trusted on the subject of Caesar's friends and enemies is firmly stated by Plutarch (T2).

A collection of biographies is perfectly possible, although it must be remembered that lives of Pompey and Marius remain hypothetical, as indeed is the biography of Caesar, although some sort of memoir of him seems virtually certain. Three anecdotes grouped together in Plut. *Caes.* 17.6–11 appear to have been taken from Oppius, who is the named authority for Caesar's ability to dictate letters on horseback (F6); the story about the olive oil (Plut. *Caes.* 17.9–10) is attributed to him by Suetonius (F7), and he himself is the subject of the third story (see n. 1), which must come from a personal reminiscence. It has long been recognized that Oppius must be Plutarch's source for the whole of this section, and many have suspected that he lies behind much else in the surviving biographical accounts. Thouret believed that all the material in Plutarch and Suetonius about Caesar's early life, at least down to the consulship, derives from Oppius;[13] Pelling singles out as possible Oppian elements the escape from Sulla, the trip to Nicomedes, the pirate adventure, the study under Apollonius, the early rhetorical successes at Rome, and further details of his boyhood now missing from the text.[14] Townend adds the stories in Plut. *Caes.* 16 (reproduced in the same order in Val. Max. 3.2.22–23a, 3.8.7) illustrating the devotion of Caesar's soldiers to their leader, and their willingness to sacrifice everything for him; he also adduces arguments to suggest that the work was a panegyrical collection of anecdotes without much chronological context, and that it may have provided the model for Suetonius' method of ordering groups of similar anecdotes to exemplify different aspects of a subject's moral character.[15]

(CJS, TJC)

[11] Peter 2. lxii–lxiii. Münzer agreed that the fragments on Marius and Pompey (F5–6) belonged to the work on Caesar (cf. *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 364–5 n. 2), and further suggested (*RE* 18. 734) that Oppius appended to it his refutation of the alleged Caesarian paternity of Ptolemy Caesarion, in a revised edition published *c.*32 BC; but this goes against the evidence of Suetonius' words in T3, where a separate work (*liber*) is clearly indicated.

[12] Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt*, 32.

[13] Thouret, *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 355–60.

[14] Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 13. It is a most unfortunate coincidence (thus Briscoe, *CR* 27 (1977), 178) that the parts dealing with Caesar's birth, upbringing, and childhood are missing from both Plutarch's and Suetonius' lives.

[15] Townend, *AJPh* 108 (1987), 325–42.

41

L. Cornelius Balbus

Editions: Peter 2. lxi–lxiii, 46.

Principal discussions: E. Jullien, *De L. Cornelio Balbo maiore* (Paris, 1886: *non uidimus*); Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900), 337; F. Münzer, 'L. Cornelius (69) Balbus', *RE* 4 (1901), 1260–8; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 343, 350; Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt* (1938), 33–4, 38; C. Nicolet, *L'Ordre équestre* 2 (Paris, 1974), 853–5, no. 118; Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 464–5.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

L. Cornelius Balbus was born in Gades, and obtained Roman citizenship from Pompey in 72 BC. In the *Pro Balbo* (56 BC) Cicero defended this grant when it was challenged by the optimates. While still a young man Balbus became a friend of Caesar (probably during the latter's quaestorship in Spain in 69, when he spent time in Gades: Suet. *Iul.* 7), and subsequently served him as *praefectus fabrum* in 61 and 59 (Cic. *Balb.* 63); in 60 he accompanied Caesar to Rome as a trusted adviser, and was one of the architects of the pact between Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus (Cic. *Att.* 2.3.3). At around the same time he was adopted by Pompey's friend, the historian Theophanes of Mitylene (Cic. *Balb.* 57; *Att.* 7.7.6; cf. T1).

From this time on Balbus served as Caesar's confidential agent and financial adviser,[2] for the most part working behind the scenes; he also acted, in effect, as Caesar's publicity officer.[3] From the start of the civil war he is often mentioned together with C. Oppius, and during the dictatorship the two men managed affairs in Rome in Caesar's absence (Tac. *ann.* 12.60.6, and see introduction to Oppius, no. 40). Letters survive from Balbus urging Cicero to join him in 49 (Cic. *Att.* 8.15A, 9.7A (written with Oppius), 9.7B, 9.13A). The eighth book of the *Bellum Gallicum* (by A. Hirtius) is dedicated to Balbus (*BGall.* 8 *praef.*). His role in events after Caesar's assassination is not recorded, but it was probably Balbus who communicated with Octavian and kept him informed of events at Rome;[4] and on Octavian's return to Italy Balbus was one of the first to meet him, at Naples on 19 April (Cic. *Att.* 14.10.3). That he continued to serve the young Caesar is certain, although no details survive; he disappears from the record after November 44 until 40 BC when he reappears as

[1] In addition to the works of Jullien, Münzer, and Nicolet cited in the bibliography, see A. Alföldi, *Oktavians Aufstieg zur Macht* (Bonn, 1976), 31–4, 36–53.

[2] Cf. Shackleton Bailey, *Letters to Atticus* 1. 358.

[3] The phrase is that of T. P. Wiseman, in K. Welch, A. Powell (eds.) *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter* (London, 1998), 1–9.

[4] Alföldi, *Oktavians Aufstieg zur Macht* (Bonn, 1976), 46–8.

suffect consul—doubtless a reward for services rendered.[5] He was still alive in 32, when he was present at the bedside of the dying Atticus (Nepos *Att.* 21.4). In his will he left 25 denarii to every Roman citizen (Dio 48.32.2).

Work

Like Oppius, Balbus was evidently a cultured man with intellectual and literary interests;[6] but references to his own literary activity have been subject to some doubt. He is described in the *Historia Augusta* as a writer of history (T1), although it is possible that the author has confused him with his adoptive father Theophanes of Mytilene.[7] Sidonius Apollinaris (T2) names him as the author of a 'diary' (*ephemeris*), in a list of historians of Julius Caesar, together with Livy, Suetonius, and Juventius Martialis (no. 106), but many, including Peter, have thought that Sidonius mistakenly believed Balbus to be the author of book 8 of the *Bellum Gallicum*.[8] But there is no compelling reason why the two testimonia should not be taken at face value, and Balbus seen as the author of a historical memoir of Caesar. This would then be the work from which Suetonius cited F1.

(CJS, TJC)

[5] Syme, *RR* 131, 220.

[6] Both were friends of Cicero, Atticus, and Varro (Cic. *fam.* 9.6.1). Cicero asked their advice on a letter he thought of sending to Caesar in May 45 (*Att.* 12.51.2; 13.1.3)—they suggested so many changes that he evidently decided to drop it (*Att.* 13.27.1)—and in July Cicero was concerned that Balbus should have a fully finished version, rather than an unrevised draft, of *De finibus* book 5 (*Att.* 13.21a.4; 13.22.3).

[7] Thus Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, 184; *Emperors and Biography*, 5: 'the author has muddled the item'. The attempt of C. Cichorius (*Rom und Mitylene* (Leipzig, 1888), 7) to rescue the author by emending the text (see *apparatus* to T1) has not won acceptance.

[8] Peter 2. lxiii, following K. Nipperdey, *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii* (Leipzig, 1847), 36; see also Münzer, *RE* 4. 1268; Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt*, 38; Gascou, *Suétone historien*, 464–5. *Contra*: Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (1900), 337.

42

M. Valerius Messalla Rufus

Editions: Peter 2. lxxviii, 65.

Principal discussions: H. Peter, review of A. Schaefer, *Abrisz der Quellenkunde der griechischen und römischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1881–2), *NJPhP* 125 (1882), 107–8; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 112–13, 115, 279, 350–3; Schanz-Hosius 1[4] (1927), 600; L. Strzelecki, *Quaestiones Verrianae* (Warsaw, 1932), 24–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 270 n. 4, 309–10; R. Hanslik, 'M. Valerius (268) Messalla Rufus', *RE* 8A (1955), 166–9; H. J. Bäumerich, *Über die Bedeutung der Genealogie in der römischen Literatur* (diss. Cologne, 1964), 17–19, 27 n. 1–2, 55–8, 73–6; R. A. Billows, 'The last of the Scipios', *AJAH* 7 (1982), 53–68; H. Zehnacker, 'Le Triens des Servilii et le bronze patrimonial', in *Studi per Laura Breglia* 2 (*Bollettino di Numismatica* Suppl., 1987), 9–17.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

A candidate for the praetorship of 61,[2] Messalla was born no later than 101 BC (unless patricians enjoyed an accelerated career). A nephew of the orator Hortensius, he became Sulla's brother-in-law on the latter's marriage to his sister Valeria and probably owed his early admission to the augurate to Sulla's patronage.[3] His later career is unknown until he survived the bribery scandal of 54 BC to become consul for 53. Two years later, however, he was convicted of electoral corruption:[4] whether he was fined or forced into exile (presumably returning as a result of Caesar's amnesty in 49) is uncertain. No friend of Pompey,[5] he served under Caesar in the civil war, from which he may have profited through the acquisition of confiscated property (cf. Cic. *Att* 14.10.2), but subsequently took no prominent part in political life. His tenure of the augurate for fifty-five years may put his death *c.*26 BC when he had perhaps seen one or even two sons reach the consulship, in 32 and 29 respectively.[6]

[1] For full documentation see Hanslik, *RE* 8A. 166–9.

[2] Cic. *Sull.* 42 with D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches* (2nd edn., Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992), 96 (suggesting also that he is the youthful Valerius Messalla who assisted the younger Roscius: Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 149); cf. his possible prosecution in 60 (Cic. *Att.* 2.3.1 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc.).

[3] Hortensius: Val. Max. 5.9.2. Valeria: Plut. *Sull.* 35.6 with Syme, *RP* 1. 266; cf. Cic. *Sull.* 20 with D. H. Berry ad loc. (Cambridge, 1996). Augurate: Macr. 1.9.14; n. 12; Cichorius, *RS* 234.

[4] Cic. *fam.* 8.4.1; cf. 8.2.1; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 131–5.

[5] Cic. *Att.* 4.9.1 (perhaps referring to a possible candidature for the consulship of 54: F. X. Ryan *ap.* C. F. Konrad in J. Linderski (ed.), *Imperium Sine Fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic* (Stuttgart, 1996), 105–6); 15.7; Crawford, *RRC* 435 with comm. ad loc.

[6] Cf. C. Settipani, *Continuité gentilice et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale* (Oxford, 2000), 202–4 with bibliography.

Works

Messalla, perhaps himself the honorand of Varro's *logistoricus* '*Valerius uel de ualetudine*',[7] wrote a wide-ranging work on auspices.[8] In this he paraded his own refusal to assist at praetorian elections that were conducted by a praetor in breach of normal constitutional practice (Gell. 13.15.4), presumably because a higher magistrate was unavailable. This episode, and therefore the work on auspices, must date from the Caesarian or triumviral period since Cic. *Att.* 9.9.3 (cf. 9.15.2) demonstrates that no precedent for a praetor holding such elections was known prior to 49 BC (cf. Sempronius Tuditanus 10 F2 with comm.).[9] As Peter showed,[10] the consul of 53 (and not Messalla Corvinus (no. 61)) will also be the author of the books 'On Families'[11] cited by Pliny (T2) and from which F1–2 must be taken. The author who apparently features in the index to book 34 (T1) as 'Messalla (Rufus)' is clearly the 'old Messalla' cited in 34.137 (F2), and in *nat.* 35.8 (T2), as in the index to that book, this 'old Messalla' is differentiated from 'Messalla the orator', who can only be Corvinus. 'Old Messalla' must be the long-lived consul of 53,[12] and 'Rufus', rather than the name of a separate author, is most plausibly explained as a nickname used to differentiate him from his (probably distant) relative[13] and homonym, M. Valerius Messalla (Niger), the consul of 61.[14]

Dating the *De familiis* depends in part on the text and interpretation of T2.[15] Despite Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 112, this must surely go back ultimately to Messalla Rufus himself and presumably appeared in an explanatory introduction to the work, particularly as he appears in the index of sources to Pliny book 35 and is cited nowhere else in that book.[16] Münzer (whose text and punctuation appear in T2) understood Pliny to refer to a Pomponius who was adopted by will by a Scipio and who also acquired the nickname Salvitto. The individual in question will then be the

[7] Cichorius, *RS* 233–4; B. Zucchelli, *Varro Logistoricus* (Rome, 1981), 50–2. The Messalla who appeared in Maecenas' *Symposium* (DS *Aen.* 8.310), is, however, probably Messalla Corvinus, not Rufus (R. G. M. Nisbet in T. Woodman, D. Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge, 2002), 85–8).

[8] Huschke, *Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianae reliquiae* (6th edn., Leipzig, 1908), 47–50. There is no evidence, however, that Messalla was the Valerius who wrote a commentary on the Twelve Tables (Fest. 428; cf. 486).

[9] However, Linderski's confident dating of the episode to Caesar's dictatorship (*ANRW* 2.16.3, 2192–3) is unjustified: our evidence for regular elections in that period leaves little room for any such proceeding (cf. R. Frei-Stolba, *Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Zurich, 1967), 38–60).

[10] H. Peter, *JbKPh* 125 (1882), 107–8; *HRR* 2. lxxviii.

[11] Not necessarily the title of the work but used as such here for convenience.

[12] The distinguishing epithet 'augur' used elsewhere (Fest. 154; 476; Gell. 13.15.3; Macr. 1.16.28; cf. 1.9.14) differentiates him from the consul of 61 (a pontifex) but not from Corvinus (himself an augur from 36 BC).

[13] Cf. E. Badian *ap.* J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1982), 67–8; *Chiron* 20 (1990), 396; C. Settipani, *Continuité gentilice et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale* (Oxford, 2000), 200–1.

[14] Syme, *RP* 1. 263; *AA*, 227; E. Badian, *PACA* 11 (1968), 3–5; A. Cameron, *AJPh* 119 (1998), 113–17.

[15] The MS readings in the *apparatus criticus* for T2 are those of Croisille's Budé. Mayhoff attributes *inrepentes* to R(?)T.

[16] For the image of *inrepentes* cf. Fest. 476: *'serpula serpserit' ait. . .idem Me<s>alla* [sc. augur], *serpens inrepserit.*

Scipio Salvitto whom Caesar took to Africa in 46 BC,[17] but this would not help to date Messalla's visit to his *atrium* or the *De familiis*. However, powerful arguments can be marshalled against Münzer's interpretation,[18] notably the absence of any record of Salvitto being a Scipio only by testamentary adoption, a circumstance one would have expected Caesar's enemies to have exploited. Billows therefore differentiates Salvitto from Scipio Pomponianus: following Jan and reading *inrepentem*, he interprets Pliny as stating that Scipio Pomponianus had wormed his way into the house of the Africani by virtue of testamentary adoption by Salvitto[19] (for whose claimed links with the Africani cf. Plut. *Caes.* 52.5). This makes better sense of Pliny's text and would date Messalla's work after Salvitto's death and hence certainly later than 46 BC.[20] It is in any case likely that, as with his work on auspices, Messalla only turned to writing the *De familiis* after his own retirement from active political life, thus justifying Pliny's identification of him as *Messalla senex* ('old Messalla').[21]

T2 may also bear on the scope and purpose of the *De familiis*. The context in Pliny suggests that Messalla was protesting against worthless individuals appropriating the *imagines* of past military heroes and/or falsely claiming distinguished men as their ancestors. Whatever text is adopted, T2 clearly implies that in Pliny's view Messalla's outrage was prompted by the sight of the *imagines* of the Scipios in the atrium of a Pomponius who could claim the Scipionic name only by virtue of a testamentary adoption, presumably one in which he had received his inheritance purely on condition of assuming the name without any change of status (including, in this case, from plebeian to patrician).[22] On Billows' interpretation that circumstance was perhaps aggravated by the mocking sobriquet of the adopter (already noted at *nat.* 7.54), particularly if, as in the text and translation of T2 given here (following e.g. Gronovius), we take *Africanorum dedecori* with *hoc enim fuerat cognomen*, rather than (as most editors) with *inrepentes/inrepentem Scipionum nomini* (with the sense 'worming their/his way into the name of the Scipios to the disgrace of the Africani'). At all events, Messalla's denunciation reflects the contested nature of gentilician status in the first century BC and the same restrictive attitude to ancestry evident in Corvinus' indignant expulsion of the *imago* of a Laevinus from his own lineage (T2).[23] Whether

[17] Suet. *Iul.* 59; Plut. *Caes.* 52.4–5; Dio 42.58.1. So Münzer, *RE* 4. 1505–6; cf. similarly D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (2nd edn., Atlanta, Ga., 1991), 73–4 (reading *Saluittones . . . irrepentes*).

[18] R. A. Billows, *AJAH* 7 (1982), 53–6.

[19] For the subjective genitive with *adoptio* cf. Suet. *Aug.* 68. For this interpretation cf. already J. F. Gronovius, *In aliquot C. Plini Naturalis Historiae libros notae* (repr. Gotha, 1855), 93 (vol. 3, p. 830 in the Hakkens 1668/9 edition of the *Natural History* (Leiden and Rotterdam)).

[20] Later still if Salvitto were the P. Cornelius who was suffect consul in 35 BC (R. A. Billows, *AJAH* 7 (1982), 60), but the latter has now been revealed as a Dolabella (G. M. Bacci, *Kokalos* 30–1 (1984–5 (1988)), 724–5; P. Tansey, *ZPE* 130 (2000), 266).

[21] Against Münzer's supposition that the *De familiis* pre-dated a late work of Varro see F1 comm.

[22] For which cf. E. J. Weinrib, *HSCPh* 72 (1968), 252–61; C. F. Konrad, in J. Linderski (ed.), *Imperium Sine Fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic* (Stuttgart, 1996), 124–31; Linderski, *Roman Questions II* (Stuttgart, 2007), 133–40; Chr. Kunst, *Klio* 78 (1996), 93–8; *Römische Adoption* (Hennef, 2005), 116–21; *contra* e.g. L. Schumacher, *ZRG* 116 (1999), 49–70 (unconvincing).

[23] *Gens*: cf. C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan* (Cambridge, 2006), esp. 15–17, 51–5 for other relevant material. Ancestry: E. Flaig, in O. G. Oexle (ed.), *Memoria als Kultur* (Göttingen, 1995), 145–6 (but erroneously attributing the *De familiis* to Messalla Corvinus).

or not Pomponianus also misrepresented the Scipionic descent to which he laid claim, as Billows supposes, part of Messalla's purpose was presumably to identify those who could or could not properly claim distinguished ancestry. What precise form such genealogical material took we do not know. Münzer (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 352) plausibly inferred from Pliny's description of the Servilii as occupying 'a place of distinction in our magisterial records' (F2) that Pliny here reflects Messalla's own treatment of the *gens* and therefore that he concerned himself with the careers of individuals, but how detailed or comprehensive this was we cannot say. Certainly F1 does not justify the assumption that he gave a comprehensive account of even obscure members of the lineages he treated, since this datum may have been included simply as a curiosity.

Messalla's genealogical interest may, however, have extended to legendary ancestry. Strzelecki[24] pointed to a number of entries in Festus (abridging the Augustan Verrius Flaccus' work on the meaning of words) and Paulus (abridging Festus) which record the descent of various Roman aristocratic *gentes* from a range of figures from the distant past: the Aurelii (22), Aemilii (22), Caecilii (38), Calpurnii (41), Cloelii (48), Fabii (77), Mamilii (116), and Nautii (164). He argued that Verrius is likely to have drawn these immediately from the same source; Atticus, Varro, and Hyginus can all be excluded as that source, Atticus because he probably treated only two of these *gentes*, Varro and Hyginus because only four are attributed a Trojan origin; Messalla's *De familiis* is therefore the only known compilation from which this material (and perhaps other material in Festus pertaining to family history) could be taken.[25] This is undoubtedly plausible, but the possibility that Verrius drew on different sources or traditions, especially where he gave variants (Paul. Fest. 22; 38; 77) cannot be excluded. However, the catholic array of *gentes* included here would certainly match the implications of F1 and F2, which suggest that Messalla included not only patrician lineages of high and ancient distinction like the Servilii, rated among the Alban *gentes* (Livy 1.30.2; DH 3.29.7), but much lesser and more recent plebeian lineages such as the Aelii (Tuberones).[26] Moreover, both F1 and F2 imply that the scope of the work extended into antiquarian curiosities and the like. It is perhaps plausible to suppose that the *De familiis*, like the *De auspiciis*,[27] was an ambitious work in which Messalla sought to surpass the earlier efforts of Atticus and Varro,[28] providing a more comprehensive account of Rome's political class in terms both of the

[24] Strzelecki, *Quaestiones Verrianae* (1932), 24–9; cf. Bäumerich, *Über die Bedeutung der Genealogie* (1964), 56–8.

[25] The MSS at Paul. Fest. 83 give an entry on the *gens Aelia*, also the subject of F1, but the statement that the *gens* comprised many *familiae* does not fit the Aelii, and Lange's correction to 'Ae<mi>lia' (*RA* 1[3]. 217) is attractive despite the earlier entry on the Aemilii at Paul. Fest. 22. In either event an interest in differentiating branches of a *gens* is apparent in the source used here.

[26] For an avowedly conjectural attempt to ascribe to Messalla material in Pliny and Gellius on the Caecilii Metelli and Porcii Catones, including the evidence of funeral eulogies, see Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 350–3; J. Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 69–70.

[27] It evidently included, for example, an elevated philosophical cosmogony: Macr. 1.9.14; cf. Lyd. *mens.* 4.1; W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter* (Basle, 1959), 97–101; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 302–3.

[28] For the possibility that material from Varro's *De familiis Troianis* reached Verrius Flaccus through Messalla's work see Strzelecki, *Quaestiones Verrianae* (1932), 27, 29.

number of lineages covered and the range of material included at the very time that an ancient name still commanded prestige and status but when 'new men' were elevated to the highest offices on a scale not seen since the fourth century and new political forces threatened to destroy for ever the traditional power and independence of the old aristocracy.[29]

(AD)

[29] Similarly, the *De auspiciis* set out highly detailed norms of traditional practice as if republican institutions were still functioning largely unimpaired: cf. Gell. 13.15.4; 16.1.

43

M. Actorius Naso

Editions: Peter 2. lx, 45.

Principal discussions: M. E. Deutsch, 'Suetonius, Iulius 52.1', *CJ* 17 (1921), 161–3; Schanz–Hosius 1⁴ (1927), 350–1; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 284; Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 459.

INTRODUCTION

Nothing is known of this author except the two fragments cited in Suetonius. In F1 he is cited together with the elder Curio (on whom see I. Appendix 1, A35), and F2, if correctly attributed to Actorius Naso (see comm. ad loc.), comes from a cluster of citations about Caesar's sex-life in which Curio also features (see comm. ad loc.). Both Curio and Naso were evidently hostile to Caesar, and may have been linked in other ways, although there is no way of verifying this. Curio's work was a dialogue set in 59 BC (Cic. *Brut.* 218), and its *terminus ante quem* is the author's death in 53 (Cic. *fam.* 2.2). It is possible that Suetonius knew Curio only through Naso, but that would not help to determine either the nature of Naso's work or its date. It is often assumed that he was a contemporary of Caesar (as are all the other identifiable sources cited in Suetonius' life), and that his work was a history or biography.[1] Both assumptions are probable, but not certain; it remains possible that the fragments derive from orations, pamphlets, or verses.[2]

(CJS)

[1] In addition to works cited in the bibliography, see E. Klebs, *RE* 1 (1893), 330–1; A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900), 360.

[2] B. Baldwin, *Suetonius* (Amsterdam, 1983), 116.

44

Tanusius Geminus

Editions: Peter 2. lxv–lxvi, 49–51.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), 67, 120–2; P. E. Sonnenburg, 'Der Historiker Tanusius Geminus und die annales Volusi', in *Historische Untersuchungen A. Schaefer . . . gewidmet* (Bonn, 1882), 158–65; Münzer, 'Tanusius (2) Geminus', *RE* 4A (1932), 2231–3; A. Klotz, 'De Plutarchi vitae Caesarianae fontibus', *Mnemosyne* ser. 3.6 (1938), 313–15; Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt* (1938), 26–7, 107–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 264–5; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1 (1966), 183, 191 with n. 466; 2.2 (1966), 32; Syme, *Sallust* (1964), 96, 234; B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs* (Munich, 1979), 130.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Nothing is known of Tanusius Geminus, but given the extreme rarity of the name,[1] he is likely to be related to the L. Tanusius who was among the *equites* supposedly butchered by Catiline in the Sullan proscriptions,[2] and to the Tanusia who, according to Dio, saved her husband, T. Vinius, in the proscriptions of 43 BC.[3] Dio implies that this woman was well connected: not only is she described as a woman of rank, but a relative was in charge of *ludi* involving a theatrical performance and she was able to call on the help of Octavian's sister. Should these details be trustworthy, they suggest that members of the family had established significant links within the Roman political elite. As Wiseman points out (*New Men in the Roman Senate* (Oxford, 1971), 264), they may also support Münzer's supposition (*RE* 4A. 2231) that the historian was a senator, based on an uncertain inference from his (apparently unique) report of interventions in the senate in 55 BC (F3). If so, he made little individual mark and was presumably of junior status. That, however, he was a contemporary is virtually certain, since Suetonius (F2) names only contemporary authorities in the *Divus Iulius*.[4]

[1] For Italy see T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (Oxford, 1971), 264 no. 418 (conjecturing Clusium as the historian's origin); add for Cisalpine Gaul *CIL* 5.8465 (Aquileia); *AE* 1940, 113 (Ateste).

[2] [Q. Cic.?] *pet.* 9; Ascon. *tog. cand.* 65St=84C (Tantasium MSS); Hinard, *Proscriptions*, 399–400.

[3] Dio 47.7.4–5 (cf., less theatrically, Suet. *Aug.* 27.2; App. *b.c.* 4.44.187); Hinard, *Proscriptions*, 548–9; Gowing, *Triumviral Narratives*, 257–8. T. Vinius, a *nouus homo*, may have risen to the praetorship (*MRR* 3. 232). Nicolet, *ANRW* 1.3 (1973), 260, suggests that Tanusia may have been the daughter of Sulla's victim, Wiseman, l.c. (n. 1), the historian's daughter: she could as easily be his sister.

[4] M. Haupt, *Opuscula* 1 (1875), 72. Strasburger's argument (*Caesars Eintritt*, 26–7) that Tanusius may not have been a primary source for the late republic because he is ignored by Asconius makes large assumptions about Asconius' choice (and explicit citation) of sources and, as he recognizes, presupposes that Asconius had a copy of the work available.

Work

Seneca (T1) offers our only general characterization of the work, using the literary contrast to illustrate his argument that what matters is not length of life but its philosophical quality. The implication, that length may be in inverse proportion to quality, must suggest that Tanusius Geminus' work was notorious for being long and tedious. Seneca's evidence is, however, problematic. It has frequently been seen as an allusion to Catullus' characterization of the (verse) annals of Volusius in 95.7–8 (cf. Hortensius (31) T1 with discussion, I. 338–9). The old view that Volusius is here a cipher for Tanusius (and that the latter perhaps wrote a historical epic before embarking on his prose history) was refuted definitively by Sonnenburg, 'Der Historiker Tanusius Geminus' (1882). However, Münzer (*RE* 4A. 2232) urges that Seneca may have confused the two writers and that nothing can therefore be inferred about the character of Tanusius' history. That is a serious possibility, but Tanusius' hostility to Caesar may have revived a passing interest in his work in disaffected Neronian circles. Prose historians could be mocked for the vast scale of their works (a generic requirement according to Juv. 7.102; cf. Isid. *orig.* 6.12.1), and *uersuum* ('lines') in T1 need not refer to verse. Seneca may, therefore, be contrasting the large-scale history of Tanusius with more restricted prose works—such as his own (cf. Nepos *Ep.* 4.6). In any case, his description of Tanusius' work as *ponderosi* ('massive') must imply turgidity of content and/or style as well as monumental scale.

Suetonius' characterization of Tanusius' work as *historia* indicates that it was in prose. Whether it was in Greek or Latin we do not know, but if in Greek, it would be the only known such source to be cited in the *Diuus Iulius*. F4, if from Tanusius' history, does not imply that his work ran from the origins of Rome (as Bardon, *Lit. inconnue* 1. 265; see comm.), but F1 suggests that Tanusius gave a detailed account of Sertorius' actions in North Africa in 81–80 and therefore did not restrict himself to the post-Sullan period (as Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico*, 2.1. 183). The latest datable fragment (F3) refers to events of 55 BC and, unless Tanusius was prevented from completing his work, it must have extended at least to the outbreak of civil war, if not the death of Cato or Caesar. Seneca's characterization, if accurate, indicates a large-scale treatment; F1 and F4 (if from Tanusius) would imply the inclusion of material that appealed to the antiquarian and geographical interests of the age, at least partly in the form of excursuses that contributed little to the political or military dynamic of the narrative and perhaps gave the work a somewhat diffuse character.[5]

The date and context of composition cannot be determined with any certainty.[6] Two questions in particular have clouded the issue: the relationship of the work to those of Pollio and Sallust.

[5] Münzer, *RE* 4A. 2232, argued that the material on elephants should not be ascribed to Tanusius' *History*. That is unjustified: the ways of elephants can find their place in historiography (cf. Livy 37.39.13; Dio 39.38.5) and there was growing interest in Africa in the late republic (R. Oniga, *Sallustio e l'etnografia* (Pisa, 1995), 52–4). Tanusius need not have included his digression on elephants in his account of Sertorius in 81/80, but if he did, he clearly puffed up a transitory phase of Sertorius' career well beyond its real significance.

[6] On the relationship with Varro in F4 see comm. ad loc.

F3a and 3b are generally assumed to derive from a common source used by Appian and Plutarch, which here compared and contrasted Caesar's account in the *Bellum Gallicum* with that of Tanusius (as often, Appian does not name the source in question). This is part of a wider pattern of common material in Plutarch and Appian that is frequently attributed to their independent use of Pollio.[7] Yet apart from the more general uncertainties surrounding the 'Pollio hypothesis' (see introduction to Pollio, no. 56), it is odd that Pollio should cite Tanusius as an authority for an episode which, even if it found no place in the preserved *acta senatus* (cf. P. White, *Chiron* 27 (1997), 83), must have created considerable contemporary reverberations and which occurred when Pollio himself was already active in Roman social and political life and so probably had first-hand information.[8] That might point to the use of another, intermediary source by Plutarch and Appian.[9] It is likely, nonetheless, that Tanusius preceded Pollio, not least because F2 shows him writing, probably from a highly partisan perspective, under the influence, and with the preoccupations, of the propaganda of the early 50s: by the time Pollio started work, perhaps in the late 30s, such issues had surely faded into the background. The preoccupation with Caesar and Cato in F3 also suggests a work at least begun during their lifetime or soon after their deaths, and Plut. *Cato Min.* 51.1–5 (see F3 comm.) raises tantalizing questions about the extent of Tanusius' contribution to the leitmotif of Cato's prescience in regard to Caesar that marks later surviving sources for this period.

Tanusius' relationship to Sallust is no less contentious. It cannot be more than conjecture that Tanusius is among those historians pilloried by Sallust for their ignorance of African ethnography or misrepresentation of Sertorius.[10] The more substantial question concerns the relationship of F2 to Sallust's *Catiline*. F2 is remarkable for its omission of any mention of Catiline in the alleged plot of Crassus and Caesar in 66/5. That cannot be the work of Suetonius: it must have characterized the sources he cites, starting with Bibulus in 59 BC.[11] Although allegations about Catiline's involvement in a plot or plots in 66/65 had already surfaced at the trial of Sulla in 62, and perhaps also the trials of Autronius and L. Vargunteius earlier that year,[12] they evidently made no lasting impression in the years immediately following; and in any case, if Crassus (with Caesar) was to be identified as the principal author and beneficiary of the plot, the introduction of Catiline might appear an unwelcome complication in a story designed to suggest that the plans of 66/65 were close

[7] See 1. 440 n. 64. Others have proposed Strabo as the common source: so esp. P. Otto, *Quaestiones Strabonianae* (*LSKPh* 11 Suppl., 1889), 285–8.

[8] Cf. Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 35 n. 69.

[9] Cf. Plut. *Caes.* 52.9; App. *b.c.* 2.95.400 where Caesar's intervention in an engagement prior to Thapsus is given as a matter of report: Pollio was present with Caesar on this campaign and presumably in a position to give authoritative information (likewise about Caesar's presence at Thapsus itself: Plut. *Caes.* 53.5–6). Similarly perhaps Plut. *Caes.* 29.7; *Pomp.* 58.3; App. *b.c.* 2.25.97.

[10] Africa: *Iug.* 17.7 with R. Oniga, *Sallustio e l'etnografia* (Pisa, 1995), 51–2. Sertorius: *hist.* 1.88M with P. McGushin, *Sallust, Histories* 1 (Oxford, 1992), 158. On the possibility that Plut. *Sert.* 9.6–7 derives from Tanusius through a citation in Sallust's *Histories* see comm. on F1.

[11] So R. Seager, *Historia* 13 (1964), 341 n. 18.

[12] Cic. *Sull.* 67–8 (cf. *Cat.* 1.15); Drummond, *RhM* 142 (1999), 301–2.

to becoming a reality in 59.[13] Tanusius clearly followed and developed this latter tradition (Suetonius gives no hint that he presented it as one of a number of rival versions). Yet it is questionable whether he could have done so after the publication of Sallust's *Catiline*, with its elaborate account of a plot in which Catiline was a central player and Caesar conspicuous by his absence (*Cat.* 18.1–19.6), particularly if Catiline was deemed responsible for the death of one of Tanusius' own close relatives. More probably, Sallust's account is a partial riposte to that encountered in Tanusius (so e.g. E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius* (3rd edn., Stuttgart, 1922), 18 n. 2) or both authors worked contemporaneously and independently in the late 40s. Similar issues arise with Sallust's *Histories*.[14]

F1 and F2 indicate that in different ways Tanusius was a peculiarly uncritical historian, even by ancient standards;[15] and F4 (if from our work) implies a capacity for ingenious but absurd reconstruction. F2 and F3 also suggest a strongly partisan account of late republican political history. Together perhaps with other perceived deficiencies of the work (above) and the author's own lack of personal *auctoritas*, these led to its rapid eclipse by others who had (almost) as good a claim to be contemporary witnesses.[16] It may have been used, directly or indirectly, by Strabo for his *Hypomnemata historika* (F1 comm.),[17] but is not cited by Asconius or the elder Pliny (despite a shared interest in elephants: see, however, comm. on F1). It was left to Suetonius to resurrect it, and since F3 as well as F2 is reflected in his biography of Caesar (cf. *Iul.* 24.3), it is likely that more of his material in the *Diuus Iulius* than he acknowledges is owed to Tanusius,[18] who may have contributed significantly to Suetonius' depiction of Caesar as a restless opportunist of vaunting ambition and arrogance, never deterred by the frequent failure of his schemes or the opposition of his enemies or the optimates (among whom Cato occupies a place of prominence). But as with so much about this historian, more specific data, let alone certainty, elude us.

(AD)

[13] Likewise there is no clear evidence that Bibulus and the rest (other than Cicero) alleged any involvement of Crassus or Caesar in the main Catilinarian conspiracy. It may be significant that for that episode Suetonius adduces only the contemporary allegations of Curius and Vettius (*Iul.* 17.1–2): did Tanusius have nothing more to report?

[14] For the view that Tanusius was Sallust's Aunt Sally in the *Histories* see Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico*, 2.2. 32.

[15] Suet. *Iul.* 9.3, however, may imply that he either did not know or did not repeat the accusations of Curio (and Actorius Naso) about a planned co-ordinated rising of Caesar and Piso.

[16] It may, at least before Livy, have been of some importance for its narrative of the period 66–61, which neither Sallust nor (probably) Pollio covered.

[17] W. Aly, *Strabonis Geographica* 4 (Bonn, 1957), 114–34, suggested that Tanusius was used extensively as a source by Strabo for his account of Spain in book 3 of the *Geographica*, but there are other possibilities: see F. Lasserre, *Strabon, Géographie* 2 (Paris, 1966), 4–11; D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amasia* (London, 2000), 182.

[18] So perhaps much of the hostile perspective on Caesar's Gallic campaigns in *Iul.* 24.2–3 and other items that do not appear elsewhere, including material with an antiquarian dimension (e.g. *Iul.* 20.1 on the *fasces*).

45

Cornelius Nepos

Editions: Peter 2, xxxx–lvi, 25–40; E. Malcovati, *Cornelii Nepotis quae exstant* (Turin, 1944), 177–206; P. K. Marshall, *Cornelii Nepotis uitae cum fragmentis* (2nd edn., Leipzig, 1985), 101–13; G. Wirth, *Cornelius Nepos: Lateinisch–Deutsch* (Amsterdam, 1994), 317–448.

Principal discussions: Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 322–42; Wissowa, 'Cornelius (275) Nepos', *RE* 4 (1900), 1108–17; Schanz-Hosius 1[4] (1927), 351–4; L. Alfonsi, 'Sulla cronaca di Cornelio Nepote', *RIL* 76 (1942–3), 331–40; E. M. Jenkinson, 'Cornelius Nepos and biography at Rome', *ANRW* 1.3 (1973), 703–19, esp. 703–5; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), 157–66; N. Horsfall, *CHCL* 2 (1982), 290–2; P. Decreus, 'Catulle, c.1, Cornelius Nepos et les *Aetia* de Callimaque', *Latomus* 43 (1984), 842–60; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos* (1985), 66–78; A. Luisi, 'Cornelio Nepote geografo', *CISA* 14 (1988), 41–51; Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos* (1989), xv–xxi (selected fragments translated at 31–5); Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar* (2007), 21–3.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Nepos implies (T6) that he was close in age to Atticus, who was born in 110 BC.[1] He came from Transpadane Gaul, perhaps from Ticinum (mod. Pavia),[2] and, as F. Millar argues, was one of a number of 'outsiders' who contributed to the construction of our image of Rome at this period, and was an example of the identification with Rome that such men espoused.[3] The Transpadanes acquired Latin rights in 89,[4] and Nepos may have acquired Roman citizenship by holding a magistracy in his native town; if so, his adoption of the *nomen* Cornelius may be connected with his having been registered as a citizen by Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus, one of the censors of 70: alternatively, he could have owed his enfranchisement to Sulla. At all events he was in Rome by 65 (T20=F13) and probably shortly afterwards met Atticus, whose return to Rome from Athens Nepos, with slight hesitation, dates to that year (*Att.* 4.5), and with whom he maintained close relations (T5). Despite Gellius' description of Nepos as 'as close a friend of Cicero as anyone' (T14), their relationship seems to have been more distant.

[1] Nepos *Att.* 21.1, 22.3; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 67 n. 6; Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos*, xv.

[2] The elder Pliny (T9) says that he was a 'neighbour of the Po', the younger (T11) that he was a *municeps* ('fellow townsman') of Titus Catius, described by Cicero (*fam.* 15.16.1) as an Insubrian. From this Mommsen (*Hermes* 3 (1869), 62 n. 1) argued that he came from Ticinum, since the other Insubrian cities, Mediolanum (Milan), Novaria (Novara), and Comum (Como), were too far from the Po to fit Pliny's language. Sherwin-White prefers Mediolanum, presumably thinking that the elder's language should not be pressed (*Comm.* 307; thus also O. Hirschfeld, *SPAW* 1894.1, 343; G. F. Unger, *ABAW* 16.1 (1882), 134).

[3] F. Millar, *G&R* 35 (1988), 40–1. The article (40–55) deals principally with Nepos' attitudes as revealed by his *Life of Atticus* (note esp. 42: 'the positive virtues and activities which are exhibited are those of private life, of scholarship, antiquarianism, and concern for the traditions and antiquities of Rome'). For his outlook in the biographies of foreign generals see A. C. Dionisotti, *JRS* 78 (1988), 35–49.

[4] Ascon. 12St=3C.

Nepos thought that the works of which Cicero was most proud were not worth reading (T2),[5] and whatever the precise import of Cicero's obscure description of him as 'immortal', it was clearly not meant to be complimentary.[6] Cicero did not know of the existence of a son of Nepos until he heard of his death (T3), and Nepos' disparagement of philosophy in a letter to Cicero was scarcely likely to endear him to its recipient.[7] He was also a friend of his fellow Transpadane Catullus, who dedicated his *libellus* to him (see below). The elder Pliny (T10) says that he died in the principate of Augustus, that is to say after 27 BC.

Works[8]

We first explain why we have excluded fragments of the *Exempla*, the *De uiris illustribus*, and a letter to Cicero, all of which were included by Peter.[9]

The fragments of the *De uiris illustribus* are excluded because they come from a work part of which exists in a direct tradition (cf. I. 8). Were there to have been fragments of the separate large-scale biography of Cato (T4), we should have included them. The fragment of a letter to Cicero (see above) is, obviously, not part of a work of history (and does not even have a historical content). The *Exempla* are more problematic. Of the twenty-six fragments printed by Peter,[10] only two (Peter *exempla* F1–2, Malcovati and Marshall F10, 12) are explicitly cited as coming from the work, though *in exemplis* in Gellius 6.19.1 (Peter *exempla* 3 = Malcovati and Marshall F13) probably refers to the work and *haec duo exempla* in Gellius 4.18 (= Malcovati and Marshall F11) may do so (cf. commentary on F9).

Peter *exempla* F5 (= Malcovati F15) is attributed by Marshall (F62) to the *De uiris illustribus* (cf. Geiger, *Historia* 29 (1980), 112–14), while Peter *exempla* F4 (= Malcovati and Marshall F14) could have come from a book of the *De uiris illustribus* dealing with philosophers (cf. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 91). The remainder of the fragments attributed to the *exempla* by Peter, Malcovati, and Marshall fall into two groups:

(a) Peter *exempla* F6–16, 20 (= Malcovati F16–26, 30, Marshall F15–25, 29) are a series of geographical fragments from Pomponius Mela and the geographical books of the elder Pliny. Their attribution to the *Exempla* is entirely arbitrary, and it would

[5] One wonders which works Nepos made copies of (T15). On the problems of T15 cf. the contrasting views of J. E. G. Zetzel, *HSCPh* 77 (1973), 225–43 and M. McDonnell, *CQ* 46 (1996), 469–91 (whose interpretation of *descripta* is anticipated by Geiger, *Latomus* 44 (1985), 270).

[6] See Shackleton Bailey ad loc.

[7] Lact. *inst.* 3.15.10 (= T16). All other references to the correspondence (T13; 21–4) are to letters of Cicero to Nepos; it ran to at least two books (T23), but as with *ad Brut.* and a number of correspondents in *fam.* clearly contained letters addressed to Cicero. On Nepos' relations with Cicero see further Geiger, *Latomus* 44 (1985), 261–70.

[8] Apart from his prose works, Nepos also wrote love-poetry (T12).

[9] Peter used separate numbering sequences for each work (Malcovati, Marshall, and Wirth, who were editing Nepos, not fragments of historians, have a continuous sequence). Malcovati and Marshall largely follow Peter's attribution of fragments to the various works, but Wirth attributes only those fragments specifically cited as belonging to the work, even to the extent of refusing to assign F13 to the biography of Cicero (though he does assign Gell. 6.19.1–7 to the *Exempla* (cf. comm. on F9)).

[10] Malcovati and Marshall have twenty-seven, because they include Gell. 4.18.

in fact be strange if a work entitled *Exempla* included such detailed material on distances, location, latitude, etc. Wiseman,[11] observing that Peter himself (liii) had drawn attention to the fact that Apollodorus' *Chronica* are cited by Stephanus of Byzantium on twenty-two occasions for the sites of cities and peoples, implausibly attributed them to the *Chronica*. The detail of many of these fragments has no counterpart in Apollodorus (although this may be due to selectivity in Stephanus' citations of the latter[12]), and whilst geographical material of various kinds was not infrequently incorporated in Greek chronographical works, it is hard to see how the extended discussion of the Ocean (Peter *exempla* F6–7=Malcovati F16–17, Marshall F15–16) or the particulars about the distance between the Black and Caspian Seas (Peter *exempla* F15=Malcovati F25, Marshall F24) or the circumference of the Black Sea (Peter *exempla* F12=Malcovati F22, Marshall F21) could have been incorporated into the 'foundation stories and genealogical aetiologies' which Wiseman sees as the appropriate contexts for geographical material in this kind of work, especially as he goes on to assert that 'the *Chronica* presumably gave names and dates without very much elaboration'.[13] It is much more plausible to believe that all or most of the geographical fragments come from a separate work of geography.[14]

(b) Fragments from the elder Pliny concerned with the development of *luxuria* at Rome, particularly in Nepos' own day (Peter *exempla* F17–9; 21–5=Malcovati F27–9; 31–5, Marshall F26–8; 30–4). Those who attribute them to the *Exempla* hold that it was a work concerned, in whole or in part, with 'remarkable customs' (Peter liii–liv) or cultural and social history (Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 322–33; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 75), pointing to the fact that the index to Pliny *nat.* 7 not only records Nepos as a source but also lists amongst its contents *exempla* ('instances') of such diverse matters as variation on the length of pregnancy, prodigious fertility, *pietas*, changes of fortune, and sudden death. Pliny may indeed have drawn some of his 'instances' from Nepos, but it does not follow that they came from a work entitled *Exempla*, and in fact none of the *luxuria* fragments comes from book 7.[15] As they stand, the *luxuria* fragments look as if they belong to a work charting the development of Roman decadence: it may indeed be that this, and the entire focus on *luxuria*, merely reflects Pliny's selection and reworking of material which appeared in a more

[11] *Clio's Cosmetics*, 159–60. Similarly F. Cipolla, *RFIC* 11 (1883), 372–7; for other views cf. Luisi, *CISA* 14 (1988), 44.

[12] Cf. K. Clarke, *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis* (Oxford, 2008), 60–2.

[13] *Clio's Cosmetics*, 161; similarly Ducreux, *Latomus* 43 (1984), 849; cf. also Schanz–Hosius 1⁴. 354.

[14] Cf. e.g. Wissowa, *RE* 4. 1411; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 76–7; Luisi, *CISA* 14 (1988), 41–51. Further bibliography: K. G. Sallmann, *Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro* (Berlin and New York, 1971), 122–5.

[15] The material from book 7 that Münzer himself (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 322–5) ascribes to Nepos is in fact much closer to the moralizing stories of Peter *exempla* F2–3 (=Malcovati and Marshall F12) and Malcovati and Marshall F11 (see n. 10) than to the *luxuria* fragments. Münzer (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 325) also adduces the index to book 33, where Nepos is again registered as a source and where the list of contents includes *frugalitatis antiquae in argento exempla*. The subject matter here does correspond with Peter *exempla* F22 (=Malcovati F32, Marshall F31 (Pliny *nat.* 33.146)), but that fragment does not constitute an *exemplum*, any more than the others cited by Pliny, at least in their current form.

anecdotal context in Nepos (that is the implication of Münzer's discussion),[16] but it is equally possible that these fragments too come from a separate, otherwise unattested, work.

Thus the only fragments that can safely be assigned to the *exempla* concern a Vestal Virgin, the Roman prisoners sent to Rome by Hannibal after the battle of Cannae to secure an exchange of prisoners, and, probably, the trials of the Scipios. The last two are found also in Valerius Maximus (2.9.8, 3.7.1d, 4.1.8), and Vestal Virgins appear a number of times in his work (1.1.6–7, 10, 5.4.6, 6.1.ext.3, 8.1.absol.5). Nepos' *Exempla*, like the *Facta et dicta memorabilia* of Valerius, were probably a collection of anecdotes arranged thematically, not chronologically. They contained a good deal of historical material, but they were not, and did not claim to be, a work of history. However, three fragments commonly assigned to the *Exempla* (Peter *exempla* F9, 14, 23=Malcovati F19, 24, 33; Marshall F18, 23, 32) could conceivably belong to the *Chronica*, and we have tentatively included them there (F7–8, 10), together with Peter *exempla* F26 (=Malcovati F36; Marshall F35), included as F11.

We thus come to the two works of Nepos which do qualify for inclusion in this edition.

Chronica[17]

The dedicatory poem of Catullus[18] indicates that the work consisted of three books[19] and that Nepos was the first Italian to compose such a work, embracing the whole of history. Although *omne aeuum* ('the whole of history') strictly implies all history from the beginning of time, the work also evidently extended beyond Rome and Italy, as is demonstrated by the certain or probable references to Homer (F1), Archilochus (F4), and Alexander the Great (F6); and, as the first three fragments show, it included literary as well as political figures. On the other hand there is no evidence that it included anything beyond the Graeco-Roman world, but the implicit correlation and comparison of Greece and Rome is itself significant.[20] It apparently included fabulous

[16] Cf. perhaps *nat.* 17.1–6, where an anecdote that Münzer (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 329, following L. Urlichs (*Chrestomathia Pliniana* (Berlin, 1857), 218)) and L. Traube (*Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* 3 (Berlin, 1920), 17) ascribe to Nepos because he is the author first named in the list of sources for the book includes the incidental information that C. Aquilius owned the finest house in Rome in 92 BC; cf. the similar material in Val. Max. 9.1.4.

[17] The *Chronica* are included here on the assumption that they were written in prose. For the view that Nepos, like Apollodorus, wrote in verse see A. Rostagni, *Scritti minori* 2.2 (Turin, 1956), 82–5; Alfonsi, *RIL* 76 (1942–3), 331–2 (neither is persuasive).

[18] Catull. 1 (T1). That the addressee is indeed Nepos is asserted by Auson. *praef. uariae* 4.1–3 Green, and is accepted here (*pace* C. J. Simpson, *RBPh* 70 (1982), 53–61, who argues that Catullus is addressing Sisenna!). Its praise of Nepos is not to be regarded as in any way insincere; cf. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 170–1; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 68; A. J. Woodman in D. C. Braund, C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture: Essays in Honour of T. P. Wiseman* (Exeter, 2003), 194. Helvius Cinna F1 Courtney on wealth piled up from the foundation (years) of Argos, Athens, and Thebes may allude to (pre-Trojan War) chronological data in Nepos' recently published work.

[19] On Catullus' use of *charta* to refer to a *uolumen* see C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus, a commentary* (Oxford, 1961), ad loc.

[20] Geiger (*Cornelius Nepos*, 69) argues that it was the first Roman historical work not exclusively concerned with Roman or Italian history (but see introductions to Cato (1. 203–4) and Lutatius (1. 342–3) for possible predecessors). For some material relevant to the contemporary context of the work cf. A. C. Dionisotti, *JRS* 78 (1988), 36–8.

material (T17),[21] and if F2 comes from the *Chronica*, it went back before the fall of Troy (F2), as the Parian Marble and Castor also did (whether Nepos wrote after the publication of Castor cannot be determined but seems unlikely). Given its length, it cannot have done more than refer to historical events very briefly, giving a date (sometimes, perhaps, not a precise one) in each case. Nepos apparently made some use of Olympiad, consular, and *a.u.c.* dating, but it cannot be assumed that he used all three regularly or even that he systematically used one rather than a variety of chronological devices (including, for example, interval dating), although it is notable that in F6 he is reported as giving a Roman date for Greek as well as Roman events.[22] This may suggest that he was writing at least partly for readers unfamiliar with Greek and Greek literature.[23] It is also possible that some topics were handled thematically in an excursus, as Apollodorus had done, at least in book 4, and as Velleius Paterculus was to do later, and it certainly cannot be assumed that every year was covered by an entry even in the republican period.

None of the poems of Catullus allude to an event later than 54 BC. It is likely, therefore, that the dedication was written in that year or soon after, and it follows from *iam tum* (line 5) that the *Chronica* were written some time earlier.

Although only F1 is explicitly cited from the *Chronica*, there can hardly be any doubt that citations from Nepos giving specific dates or synchronisms (F3, 4, 6) come from the work. It is equally probable that F5, on the trial and execution of Manlius Capitolinus, though introduced only by *neque multo postea* ('and not long afterwards'), also belongs to the *Chronica* (cf. below). And given Catullus' *omne aeuum*, F2, on Saturnus, is also very likely to have done so (cf. esp. F2c–d on the type of works of the authors concerned). We have tentatively included as possible fragments F9, where Nepos is not named, but which is said to have been *in chronicis*, as well as the four fragments mentioned above (7–8, 10–11) that are normally attributed to the *Exempla*.

F5 comes from Gellius' long chapter (17.21) giving synchronisms, in many cases with *a.u.c.* dates, between events and personages in Greek and Roman history, from the foundation to the Hannibalic War.[24] That fragment cites both Nepos and Varro, while F1 and F4 also come from the chapter. It can be regarded as virtually certain that Nepos and Varro were in fact Gellius' principal sources throughout, though *ex libris qui chronici appellantur* ('from the books called *chronici*') in §1 must refer to chronological works in general, not specifically to Nepos.[25] As Leuze

[21] We share Green's puzzlement at the comparison of the fables of Titianus to the *Chronica* in T17. The likely explanation is that the early part of the work (perhaps the only part Ausonius had read) included myths that could be rationalized and even used as a source of moral instruction (cf. F2; P. Ducreux, *Latomus* 43 (1984), 851, argues that Nepos followed Apollodorus in rationalizing myth). But it is hard to attach much weight to such an obscure (and possibly tendentious) passage.

[22] If Roman dates were his preferred point of reference, that would significantly enhance the sense that the work was Romanocentric: thus, L. Alfonsi, *RIL* 76 (1942–3), 333–4, perhaps relying too much on the hazards of the preserved fragments. Cf. also E. M. Jenkinson, *ANRW* 1.3, 66–7, on Nepos' tendency to Romanize, at least in superficial matters, in the *De uiris illustribus*. Variety of chronological devices: Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 22 (adducing Velleius Paterculus book 1 as a possible parallel).

[23] As in the *De uiris illustribus* (*praef.* 1–7; *Pel.* 1). Cf. Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 70; 94.

[24] He in fact goes beyond its end, for which he apologizes (§§47–50). For the rationale of this and the chapter in general see Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 32–42.

[25] As claimed by Münzer, *Beiträge* . . . *Plinius*, 336. See also L. 420 .

demonstrated,[26] while some of the *a.u.c.* dates are Varronian, others imply Nepos' foundation date of 751/750 (F3): in §9 Marathon and related events are placed in *a.u.c.* 260; in §19 the thirty tyrants at Athens are said to have been installed in *a.u.c.* 347, and in §37 the beginning of the Pyrrhic War is placed in *a.u.c.* 470. As with similar cases in other authors, however, we do not include these passages as fragments of Nepos even though he is almost certainly Gellius' source.[27] The inclusion of Marathon and the thirty tyrants shows that significant Greek (especially Athenian) political and military events were not neglected, but the related items (Miltiades, Aeschylus, Dionysius of Syracuse, Socrates), and the fragments, such as they are, lend support to the idea that, like Apollodorus, Nepos tended to focus on significant personalities, including writers and philosophers.[28]

Nepos was clearly indebted to the Greek chronographic tradition, especially Apollodorus,[29] though whether he was the first to introduce the form into Latin literature is uncertain, given the possibility that he was preceded by Lutatius (32). But he seems to have broken new ground by giving Rome a historical standing at least equivalent to that of Greece,[30] and by including cultural figures in a historical work (again following the lead of Apollodorus and others).

As for sources, Jacoby argued that for Greek material Nepos simply followed Apollodorus.[31] On this basis he attributed alleged Nepotan material of this ilk to Apollodorus both in *Apollodors Chronik* and in *FGrHist* 244. A key part of his reconstruction was the assumption that Cicero regularly draws on Nepos for Greek dates,[32] and acceptance of most, if not all, of Münzer's hypotheses about Plinian material taken from Nepos. No doubt Nepos made much use of Apollodorus, but even if we attach little importance to Catullus' *doctis . . . et laboriosis* ('learned . . . and the product of much work'), the assumption that he always did so is highly questionable (cf. comm. on F1 and F4).[33]

As a pioneering work Nepos' *Chronica* is likely to have been influential, both in his own time and later; for its use by Cicero, Pliny, and Gellius see the foregoing

[26] O. Leuze, *RhM* 66 (1911), 237–74, largely superseding the work of G. F. Unger, *RhM* 35 (1880), 13–23. His conclusions are reprised, not entirely satisfactorily, by E. Fantham, *LCM* 6.1 (1981), 7–17. Leuze also rejects the supposition that Nepos included the dictator years (239 n. 1 with the discussion in his *Röm. Jahrzählung*, 165, 173–4, to which he there refers).

[27] Cf. Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 337–42, discussing other passages which he believes to have come from the *Chronica*.

[28] So Alfonsi, *RIL* 76 (1942–3), 335; E. Fantham, *LCM* 6.1 (1981), 7; P. Ducreux, *Latomus* 43 (1984), 849–50, 857–8.

[29] Nepos' title invites comparison with Apollodorus (cf. B. Croke, *Chiron* 31 (2001), 296), whose work was also entitled *Chronica*.

[30] Cf. Alfonsi, *RIL* 76 (1942–3), 332–3, who also stresses the significance of Nepos' friendship with, and appreciation of, Catullus; cf. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* 177 (Nepos and Catullus shared the same Hellenizing outlook).

[31] F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), 34 and *passim*, following e.g. E. Rohde, *RhM* 36 (1881), 534–6.

[32] Cf. also Alfonsi, *RhM* 93 (1949–50), 59–65; *WS* 80 (1967), 153–5; E. Fantham, *LCM* 6.1 (1981), 13–17; further bibliography in Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 181 n. 1.

[33] For a critique of Cicero's supposed debts to Nepos (and through him to Apollodorus), see Fleck, *Cicero als Historiker*, 181–94.

paragraphs; others who may have made extensive use of it include Velleius Paterculus and Jerome.[34]

The biography of Cicero[35]

The work was presumably written after Cicero's death,[36] although the first version of the *Atticus* was written during its subject's lifetime. The fact that it contained at least two books (F12 *primo*) shows that it was separate from the *De uiris illustribus*, which must, however, have included a briefer life of Cicero just as it did of the elder Cato.[37] F12 is explicitly cited from the *Life* and F13 may belong to it. Both concern matters of fact, and we thus have no idea what value-judgements, if any, it contained. In this connection it is relevant to mention the fragment (Peter *de inlustribus uiris* F17=Malcovati F57, Marshall F58) from the preface to Nepos' *De Latinis historicis*, in which Cicero's literary achievement is given high praise, and the fact that he did not live to write a history lamented. How this fragment is to be reconciled with T2 is not at all clear (but see above, and nn. 4–5).

The sources Nepos is likely to have used for the *Life* are discussed by Geiger.[38]

Other fragments

We also include two fragments (F14–15) cited for linguistic reasons, with no indication of context, since one or both could have come from the *Chronica* or the biography.

(JB, AD)

[34] Velleius: Alfonsi, *RIL* 76 (1942–3), 336–40; E. A. Kramer, *Historia* 54 (2005), 154–5 (with further bibliography); *contra* E. Rohde, *RhM* 36 (1881), 548–52. Jerome: G. D'Anna, *ArchClass* 25–6 (1973–4), 166–237; *Athenaeum* 88 (2000), 547–58; *contra* G. Brugnoli, *Curiosissimus excerptor. Gli 'additamenti' di Girolamo al 'Cronico' di Eusebio* (Pisa, 1995) (*non uidimus*).

[35] The precise title is uncertain.

[36] Cf. Peter 2. lv; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 101.

[37] Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 89; *Latomus* 44 (1985), 268.

[38] *Latomus* 44 (1985), 269.

46

M. Tullius Tiro

Editions: Peter 2. xvii–xx, 5–6.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), 129–35; K. Jaufmann, *Marcus Tullius Tiro* (Progr. Dilligen, 1896/7); A. Gudeman, *The Sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero* (Philadelphia, 1902), 26–47: Schanz-Hosius 1[4] (1927), 547–8; W. C. McDermott, 'M. Cicero and M. Tiro', *Historia* 21 (1972), 259–86; B. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs* (Munich, 1979), 114–19.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Tiro, perhaps born in the early 70s, was significantly younger than Cicero,[2] and probably a home-bred slave.[3] He first appears in Cicero's correspondence in 54 already as a trusted adjutant (Cic. *ad Q.f.* 3.1.10) and was manumitted the following year. Thereafter he appears as Cicero's principal freedman, addressed in increasingly familiar terms, although a proper distance was maintained by both parties.[4] In his wide range of responsibilities he resembles other prominent freedmen of the period; what set him apart from many was his culture and learning (cf. Q. Cicero ap. Cic. *fam.* 16.16.2), though the scope of his services here may not be as great as the eulogies of Cicero (e.g. *Att.* 7.5.2) and Gellius (6.3.8; 13.9.1; 15.6.2) might imply: the correspondence only refers to him specifically as acting as an interpreter of Cicero's handwriting (*fam.* 16.22.1) or critic of his linguistic usage (*fam.* 16.17.1) and as assembling a selection of Cicero's letters preparatory to publication (*Att.* 16.5.5; cf. *fam.* 16.17.1).

Works

Tiro's known works, all probably written after Cicero's death, were confined to the two principal areas of prose practised by (and perhaps deemed appropriate to)

[1] Cf. Jaufmann, *M. Tullius Tiro* (1896–7); P. Groebe, 'M. Tullius (52) Tiro', *RE* 7A.2. 1319–25; S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969), 259–63; McDermott, *Historia* 21 (1972), 259–86.

[2] Cf. esp. Cic. *Att.* 5.20.9 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc.; 6.7.2; 7.2.3; S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969), 259–60; McDermott, *Historia* 21 (1972), 263–4; Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero*, *ad Fam.* 1. 344–5. On Jerome's statement (*chron.* 168) that Tiro grew old through to his hundredth year see R. Helm, *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik*, *Philologus* Suppbd 21.2 (Leipzig, 1929), 68 (with ibid. 73, 84–5).

[3] Cf. Cic. *fam.* 16.4.2 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc.; also Gell. 6.3.8 with Jaufmann, *M. Tullius Tiro* (1896–7), 15–16.

[4] Cf. e.g. Cic. *Att.* 13.9.1; *fam.* 16.12.2 and 16.18.1 with Shackleton Bailey ad locc.

freedmen in this period: the honouring of his patron's memory and scholarly studies, especially of language.[5] To the latter belong work(s) on the Latin language (Gell. 13.9.2), various learned letters, and works dealing with a wide range of scholarly questions, including one whose Greek title (*Pandectae*) advertised its comprehensive character.[6] He published Cicero's working-notes for his speeches (Quint. *inst.* 10.7.31; cf. 4.1.69), and probably, despite the reservations of Quintilian (*inst.* 6.3.5) and Macrobius (2.1.12), the three books of Cicero's witticisms used by Plutarch (cf. Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 81, 89 n. 50). Whether he produced 'corrected' editions of speeches of Cicero is disputed.[7] The extent of his role in the organization and publication of Cicero's letters is also uncertain.

Tiro's biography of Cicero is clearly the most likely source of Tacitus' datum in F3 and of Plutarch's citations in T1 and F2, though how far and where Plutarch uses the biography elsewhere in the *Cicero* is entirely conjectural (cf. commentary on F3).[8] For a freedman to essay biography was a recent development,[9] and Tiro's contribution clearly had, at least in part, an apologetic purpose which might lead to fabrication (F2 with commentary).[10] If F1 was part of a wider account of Milo's trial in 56 BC, Tiro evidently dealt in detail with an episode whose main relevance to Cicero himself lay in its reverberations of the controversies and conflicts that surrounded Cicero's restoration from exile in 57. There is therefore no reason to suppose that the biography ignored Cicero's political career (as e.g. Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien* (1979), 114), especially since Tiro had earlier shown both knowledge of and interest in contemporary politics (e.g. Cic. *ad Q.f.* 3.1.10; *fam.* 16.11.2–3; 12.1–4; 24.2; Q. Cicero ap. *fam.* 16.27.1–2). Tiro presumably wrote in Latin (as certainly in his other works) and F1 implies that the biography was on a substantial scale, perhaps in six to eight books, but the date of composition and relationship to (e.g.) Nepos' biography of Cicero are beyond recovery.[11]

(AD)

[5] Cic. *fam.* 16.18.3 may or may not imply that he also tried his hand at verse.

[6] Gell. 13.9.2–6; cf. Charis. 269; McDermott, *Historia* 21 (1972), 285. Pliny's notice that he used Tiro in Book 2 of the *nat. hist.* almost certainly refers to use of the *Pandectae* in *nat.* 2.106 rather than use of his biography of Cicero for a prodigy attending the Catilinarian conspiracy in 2.137: Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 98–9.

[7] Fronto 15; Gell. 1.7.1; 13.21.16; 15.6.2; Statilius Maximus' subscription to Cic. *leg. agr.* 1 or 2, with the contrasting views of J. E. G. Zetzel, *HSCPh* 77 (1973), 225–43; M. McDonnell, *CQ* 46 (1996), 477–8, 481–2.

[8] For modern hypotheses see Scardigli, *Die Römerbiographien* (1979), 114–19; J. L. Moles, *Plutarch. Cicero* (Warminster, 1988), 29; cautionary remarks in Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 61 n. 19 (but cf. ibid. 81). Plut. *Cic.* 36.7 may echo Cic. *fam.* 16.11.2 (to Tiro), but whether this (and other references in the *Cicero* to Cicero's letters) derive from Tiro must remain uncertain.

[9] For the conjecture that Cicero effectively commissioned Tiro to compose his biography and provided him with extensive information over several years see McDermott, *Historia* 21 (1972), 268–9, 283.

[10] If Tiro's biography lies behind Ascon. *Pis.* 13St=5C and Plut. *Cic.* 41.7 (C. Lichtenfeldt, *De Q. Asconii Pediani fontibus ac fide* (Breslau, 1888), 72), he was also guilty of careless error, but Lichtenfeldt's supposition is mere conjecture. Similar doubts attend the identification of Tiro as the individual responsible for misdating Cicero's *In Pisonem* in Ascon. *Pis.* 11St=1C (cf. Marshall, *Comm.* 82–3).

[11] For the possibility that the dream of Cicero portending Augustus' role in laying the civil wars to rest in Tert. *de anima* 46.7 (cf. Plut. *Cic.* 44.3–4) is cited from Tiro see Th. Vaubel, *Untersuchungen zu Augustus' Politik und Staatsauffassung* (diss. Düsseldorf, 1934), 2–3. However, the implied dating of the invention of the story appears too late for Tiro's biography, and Tertullian more probably attributes it to Augustus' *Memoirs* (cf. T. P. Wiseman in C. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (Swansea, 2009), 113–14; Augustus 60 F4 with comm.).

47

P. Volumnius

Editions: Peter 2. lxvii–lxviii, 52–3.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), 137–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 275; Gundel, 'P. Volumnius (8)', *RE* 9A.1 (1961), 876; Moles, *Comm.* (1979), esp. lvii, 459–60; J. L. Moles, 'Some "last words" of M. Junius Brutus', *Latomus* 42 (1983), 763–79.

INTRODUCTION

Life

T2 and F1 imply that Volumnius had been present with Brutus throughout his campaigns in the East and suggest that their intimacy and shared philosophical interests went far back, perhaps to a time when both were students at Athens.[1] However, Plutarch's description of Volumnius as a 'philosopher' (F1) does not imply the status of a professional philosopher any more than it does for Varro (*Rom.* 12.3) or the younger Cato (e.g. *Brut.* 2.1), or exclude the tenure of political or military posts, even though none are attested. A number of late republican Volumnii are known, but our Volumnius cannot be identified with any of them.[2] Hinard (*Proscriptions*, 549–50) conjectures that he may be the son of the P. Volumnius who served on the jury in the Cluentius case (Cic. *Cluent.* 198; cf. *MRR* 3. 224). He might (also) be related to Volumnius Flaccus, the friend of D. Brutus (Cic. *fam.* 11.12.1; 18.1), and/or the equestrian who, at his own request, was executed over the corpse of his friend M. Lucullus at Philippi (Val. Max. 4.7.4).

Work

The form of the work is not recorded, but F1, detailing portents before the second battle of Philippi, suggests that Volumnius at least gave an account of that engagement as well as of Brutus' last hours (F2). He might also be responsible for the unfavourable portents before the first battle and have described that too.[3] Whether Plutarch's failure to cite Volumnius earlier means that only these events were treated or merely reflects Plutarch's own selective use of him we cannot say. If he wrote in Latin and restricted himself to Brutus' last days, that might represent an innovation in Latin historiography, but he could equally well have written in Greek: the

[1] Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 332; *ac. post.* 12; *fin.* 5.8; Plut. *Brut.* 2.3; *tar. ill.* 82.1; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 81 n. 67. Plutarch's information about Volumnius in F1 must derive from Volumnius' own work.

[2] Cf. Hinard, *Proscriptions*, 549–50; M. Pierpaoli, *Arctos* 36 (2002), 59–78, esp. 76 n. 83. The poet Volumnius is more probably P. Volumnius Eutrapelus (cf. Courtney, *FLP* 234).

[3] Cf. D. Engels, *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen (753–27 v.Chr.)* (Stuttgart, 2007), 690–2.

specification that Brutus addressed him in Greek (T2), presumably to reinforce the appeal to their shared cultural interests and experience, would have particular significance for Greek readers. The date of composition is unknown and the extent to which he was used by later historians uncertain (cf. commentary).

Peter rightly argued that we cannot identify any other material from Volumnius in Plutarch's *Brutus* except for the rest of his description of Brutus' final hours (51.1–52.7): here Volumnius himself is prominent (T1–2), and this must represent his eyewitness account.[4] If so, it suggests that Volumnius highlighted Brutus' moral qualities as seen in the (semi-)private sphere: it explores his firmness of purpose and consideration for his companions, in an atmosphere of almost unreal tranquillity (D. Magnino loc. cit. (n. 4)), illustrating its theme through a sequence of individual episodes and in particular the final utterances of Brutus himself. Particularly in its emphasis on Brutus' inner serenity and unflinching belief in the eventual triumph of 'the just man' destroyed by the unjust individuals wrongly entrenched in power[5] it comes closer to the Socratic/Platonic model of the philosophic death than Plutarch's account of Cassius' suicide (*Brut.* 43.4–9). Although Plutarch may well have elaborated this aspect himself,[6] its essence probably goes back to Volumnius.[7] Volumnius' hagiographic intent also explains the absence from this narrative of the refusal of Brutus' surviving troops to fight on, in reality a key factor in his suicide (App. *b.c.* 4.131.549–50; cf. Dio 47.49.1): instead, Brutus dwells on the unwavering loyalty shown by his friends (52.4). It was surely Volumnius too who claimed that Brutus committed suicide unaided, perhaps unwilling to acknowledge that a Greek rhetorician (Strato) had eventually provided the assistance he himself had refused his friend.[8]

(AD)

[4] Peter 2, lxvii–lxviii; cf. Magnino on Appian *b.c.* 4 (Como, 1998), 259; Moles, *Comm.* xlvii, lvii; id., *Latomus* 42 (1983), 774; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 15; J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy* (Cambridge, 2006), 98–9.

[5] Such prophecies are an established *topos*, particularly (but not exclusively: cf. e.g. Vell. 2.71.3) in the description of the death of the *theios aner* (Stauffer, *RAC* 1. 30).

[6] Cf. the parallels between Brutus' assertions here and those in *Brut.* 29.9–11; 40.7–8.

[7] For the suggestion that T1 reflects the 'philosophical martyrological tradition' see Moles, *Latomus* 42 (1983), 773–5. Volumnius' professions of inability to recall every detail of the scene (F2) also potentially place him in the tradition of the Platonic narrator (cf. *Phaedo* 103a).

[8] For this alternative version (perhaps from Messalla Corvinus: I. 469 n. 48) see Plut. *Brut.* 52.8; 53.1; *Caes.* 69.14; also Livy *per.* 124; Vell. 2.70.4–5; App. *b.c.* 4.131.551–2; *mir. ill.* 82.6; cf. Florus 2.17.14; Dio 47.49.2; Oros. 6.18.16. Volumnius' version does not appear elsewhere.

48

Octavius Ruso

Principal discussions: Peter 2. lxxxviii; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 329; F. Münzer, 'Octavius (81) Ruso', *RE* 17 (1937), 1854; L. Herrmann, 'M. Octavius Ruso', *RÉA* 40 (1938), 384–6; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 92–3; K. Wachtel, *PIR*² 3 (1987), O 55.

INTRODUCTION

Octavius Ruso is known only from Horace's gibe and the commentators' explanation (T1). A Cn. Octavius Ruso was quaestor in 105 (Sall. *Iug.* 104) and probably praetor by 91 BC,[1] and may have been the father or grandfather of our author. For Horace he is an example of a man to be avoided, a moneylender who forces debtors who cannot pay to listen to readings of his *Histories*. The scholiasts who variously comment that he must have been a bad historian are clearly drawing an inference from the poem itself, rather than providing independent evidence, and the question is whether we should do the same. The alternative explanation, that *historiae* refers to complaints and insults, is certainly wrong. It is possible, as Nipperdey suggested (*Opuscula* (Berlin, 1877), 498), that Horace here used *historiae* in the sense of mythical stories rather than history, but this cannot be certain, as Peter rightly pointed out.[2] On balance it is most probable that Horace was indeed mocking the efforts of a man who had literary pretensions as a historian, and who subjected clients and others in his debt to recitations of his efforts. That he was literally a *faenerator* seems less likely than that, like other well-heeled Romans, he was in the habit of loaning money to friends.

(CJS)

[1] He is probably to be identified with the Cn. Octavius Cn. f. who is listed second in the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo at Asculum in 89 (*ILS* 8888), and was therefore almost certainly an ex-praetor (*MRR* 2. 24 n. 2). See Cichorius, *RS* 140; N. Criniti, *L'epigrafe di Asculum di Cn. Pompeio Strabone* (Milan, 1970), 95.

[2] Peter 2. lxxxviii: he notes that although Horace does use *historiae* to mean mythical tales (*carm.* 3.7.19), he elsewhere uses it in its normal sense of 'history' (*carm.* 2.12.9).

49

Calpurnius Bibulus

Editions: Peter 2. lxvii, 51–2.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), 139–40; Cichorius, 'L. Calpurnius (27) Bibulus', *RE* 3 (1897), 1368; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 395; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 273; Moles, *Comm.* (1979), esp. xxxii–xxxvii, liv–lvi; R. Syme, 'M. Bibulus and four sons', *HSCPh* 91 (1987), 185–98=*RP* 6 (1991), 193–204.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Bibulus, the son of Porcia (T1; F1), has generally been identified with L. Calpurnius Bibulus, who served with Brutus in the East and at Philippi, subsequently made his peace with Antony, and died in Syria in 32 BC;[1] but Syme has shown that this identification is incorrect. In fact L. Bibulus, who was born *c.*68 BC, must have been the son of M. Calpurnius Bibulus (cos. 59) by a previous marriage, since Porcia is unlikely to have been born before 74 or married to M. Bibulus before 59.[2] Bibulus the author would have been one of the two children she had had by him when Hortensius requested her as his bride, no earlier than 56 BC.[3] He will therefore have been no older than 16 at the time of Brutus' death and perhaps younger, although Plutarch (T1) has probably exaggerated his youth as well as his mother's. His further career, if any, is unknown,[4] as is the date of publication of his reminiscences.

Work

Plutarch does not indicate whether the work was in Latin or Greek and the description 'reminiscences' (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*) may be Plutarch's own. It is, however, significantly different from the term *ὑπόμνημα* that Plutarch elsewhere uses, e.g. for Sulla's memoirs (I. 284) or those of Augustus (*Brut.* 27.3; 41.7; *Ant.* 22.2=Augustus 60 F6; 7a–b). Plutarch's own use of *ἀπομνημόνευμα* specifically with reference to the memorable sayings of the individual concerned and the employment of the term in other authors to refer to what are elsewhere called *ἀποφθέγματα* lend support

[1] On him see Münzer *RE* 3. 1367–8 (n. 27); Syme, *RP* 6. 198–201.

[2] Syme, *RP* 6. 197.

[3] Plut. *Cato Min.* 25.4. On the date see esp. R. Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* (Darmstadt, 1983), 201 n. 34 (preferring 53 BC).

[4] For conjectures see Syme, *RP* 6. 202–3. He, not his stepbrother, may be the friend of Horace (*sat.* 1.10.86).

to Peter's suggestion that Bibulus' work was a collection of Brutus' *dicta*.[5] However, F1 shows that he did not restrict himself to Brutus' utterances alone but at least embedded them within their wider context, and although Brutus' own observations probably played a prominent part in the work, it may well have comprised more general reminiscences of Bibulus' stepfather on the model of Xenophon's *Apomnemoneumata* of Socrates (now termed *Memorabilia*). If so, it was probably a collection of anecdotes illustrative of Brutus' exemplary character and conduct, rather than a chronologically organized narrative biography.[6]

Works characterized as *apomnemoneumata* do not necessarily restrict themselves to personal reminiscences,[7] but if, like Xenophon (*mem.* 1.3.1), Bibulus represented his material as based on his own recollections, its scope must have been restricted (no doubt explaining its small scale). He can only have had a limited acquaintance with Brutus before he became his stepson in 45 BC, and Plutarch's *Brutus* is notably thin on the period prior to 49. Whether he accompanied his stepfather to the East is uncertain. If Syme (*RP* 6. 199) is correct in retaining the transmitted text of Cic. *ad Br.* 1.14.1 and seeing him as one of those who would benefit from the postponement of the sacerdotal elections in summer 43, he, like probably all the others named, may have been out of Italy then (presumably with Brutus) and so liable to disqualification from candidature.[8] He would, however, have stood little chance of election even if present in Rome and in view of his youth may have played Astyanax to his mother's Andromache at Brutus' departure in 44.

As well as F1, Plutarch's account of Porcia's self-inflicted wound, apparently to persuade Brutus to share the secret of the conspiracy against Caesar with her (*Brut.* 13.4–11; cf. also 14.4),[9] and his description of her feverish anxiety on the day of Caesar's assassination (*Brut.* 15.6–9, presupposing her knowledge of the plot) may also derive from Bibulus;[10] like F1 both passages conclude by focusing on Brutus' reaction, in the second instance assimilating Brutus to the traditions of philosophers and public figures who continue unperturbed despite reports of the death of a close family member.[11] If so, even when due allowance is made for Plutarch's own possible

[5] Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 139; Cichorius, *RE* 3. 1368; cf. E. Köpke, *Über die Gattung der ἀπομνημονεύματα in der griechischen Literatur* (Progr. Ritter-Akademie, Brandenburg, 1857); *contra*, C. Theander, *Eranos* 57 (1959), 123 n. 2. Plutarch: *Lyc.* 19.6; 20.4; *Cato Mai.* 9.12; cf. *mor.* 172C. Other authors: *FGrHist* 124 F4–5 with comm. (Callisthenes of Olynthus); Athen. 248d, 434d, 583f, with Körte, *RE* 13. 2472 (Lynceus of Samos).

[6] Munatius Rufus may have offered a precedent: J. Geiger, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 56–7; cf. introduction to Munatius Rufus (37).

[7] Cf. e.g. Schwartz, *RE* 2. 170; Körte, *RE* 13. 2472.

[8] Cf. Cic. *ad Br.* 1.5.3 on the problematic nature of a candidature in absence.

[9] The story reappears (with variations: Moles, *Comm.* 163–4) in Val. Max. 3.2.15; Dio 44.13.1–14.1; Polyaen. 8.32 (and (from Plutarch) Zon. 10.20), perhaps implying that an earlier author had also drawn on Bibulus for it. Plutarch's version may reflect his own views on marriage (cf. Moles, *Comm.* 162–3).

[10] So e.g. Theander, *Eranos* 57 (1959), 121–4; Moles, *Comm.* xxxii–xxxiii, 164–5, 172, 174–5.

[11] Philosophers: Moles, *Comm.* 117–18. Public figures: e.g. Cic. *Att.* 3 6.3; Sen. *Marc.* 14.3; Tac. *ann.* 3.6.2 (Caesar); Sen. *contr.* 4 praef. 4–6 (Pollio). This was a *topos* of consolatory literature (Sen. *Marc.* 2.1; cf. *epist.* 99.6), as in Cicero's *Consolatio* (*Tusc.* 3.70; Hieron. *epist.* 60.5.2; hence probably Val. Max. 5 ch.10; Sen. *epist.* 99.6; Symm. *epist.* 3.6.3; cf. F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart, 1920), 381–96; J. H. D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60* (Oxford, 1993), 112–21), Seneca's *Ad Marciam* (12.5–15.3; cf. 3.1–2; 16.1–4) and *Ad Polybium* (14.4–16.3; cf. 5.4–5; 11.2–3; 17.1–6; *Helv.* 18.6–7), and Plutarch's (?) *Letter to Apollonius* (*mor.* 1181D–119D).

elaboration of these scenes, Bibulus clearly had a taste for vivid and dramatic anecdote in which he may have sought to assimilate his mother to established literary or rhetorical models:[12] the wife privy to her husband's conspiracy provided a popular subject for declamation (Sen. *contr.* 2.5), whilst the consort terror-struck, like Andromache, at the dangers confronting her spouse (*exanimata uxor*: Cic. *Cat.* 4.3) may also have been an established *topos*.[13] However, Syme's new identification of our author and uncertainty about his movements make attempts to attribute other material in the *Brutus*[14] to Bibulus hazardous.

(AD)

[12] For Fr see commentary.

[13] Cf. its later banalization in Pliny *epist.* 4.19.3.

[14] As e.g. the anecdote in *Brut.* 24.5–6 (cf. Val. Max. 1.5.7; App. *b.c.* 4.134.564) on Brutus' quotation of *Iliad* 16.849 whilst celebrating his birthday at Athens (thus Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 140; Moles, *Comm.* 253). Despite arguments to the contrary, this may well be hostile fiction.

50

C. Furnius

Principal discussions: Peter 2. lxxxviii; A. Kappelmacher, 'Furnius (3–4)', *RE* 7.1 (1910), 375–7; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 329; E. Groag, *PIR*^{2} (1943), F 590–1; Bardon *Lit. inconnue* 2 (1956), 92; Syme, *AA* (1986), 205–7.

INTRODUCTION

The so-called Ps.-Acro, a scholiast on Horace (T1) is the only source to refer to a historical work by Furnius. Horace must be addressing one of the two C. Furnii, father and son, who were major public figures in his time (*sat.* 1.10 dates from *c.*35 BC); Jerome tells us that they were both famous orators (cf. also the reference in a corrupt passage of Tac. *dial.* 21.1), and that the son (cos. 17 BC) died before his father.[1] The father was tribune of the plebs in 50 BC and was a friend of Cicero (*Fam.* 10.1.4; 10.25, 26, etc.). Praetor in 42, he governed Asia in *c.*36–35 and fought with Antony; but he was spared by Octavian on the intercession of his son (Sen. *ben.* 2.51.1) and adlected *inter consulares* in 29 (Dio 52.42.4). The son served as legate with Augustus in the Cantabrian War (Florus 4.12.51; Oros. 6.21) and was consul in 17. Although the general scholarly consensus has been that Horace's addressee (and therefore the historian) was the younger Furnius (Peter, Kappelmacher, Schanz–Hosius, Groag; so too R. Syme, *CQ* 31 (1981), 425 = *RP* 3. 1420), we are inclined to agree with Syme's later argument that the elder Furnius is meant (*AA* 206–7, 394; *HSCPh* 91 (1987), 194 = *RP* 6, 201). Horace hails Furnius together with a number of other distinguished figures, viz. Asinius Pollio, Messalla Corvinus and his brother (actually his half-brother L. Gellius Poplicola, although he is not named), Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, and L. Calpurnius Bibulus, all of them prominent Antonians. The elder Furnius would fit much better into this group (although he would have been older than some of them) than his son, who as a young man in his twenties would be younger than any of them and unlikely to have been treated with such respect by Horace.

That said, the *Histories* remain unknown apart from the reference by the frequently unreliable Ps.-Acro, and their existence must therefore be regarded as open to some doubt.

(CJS)

[1] Jerome, *chron.* 159: *Furnii pater et filius clari oratores habentur, quorum filius consularis ante patrem moritur* ('the Furnii father and son were distinguished orators, of whom the son, who had been consul, died before the father').

51

L. Ateius Philologus

Editions: Peter 2. lvii–lviii, 41; Funaioli, *GRF* 136–41.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 580–1; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 294; Rawson, *Intellectual Life* (1985), 73–4; R. Kaster, *Suetonius De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (Oxford 1995), 138–48.

INTRODUCTION

Thanks to Suetonius' account (T1), we are reasonably well informed about Ateius Philologus, and know that he produced at least one distinctly historical work, a *breuiarium* of Roman affairs written for Sallust. The information that he was a freedman born at Athens makes it likely that he was captured during Sulla's sack of the city in 86 BC, perhaps by the centurion M. Ateius who was the first to scale the walls (Sulla 23 F15); this M. Ateius may have been the grandfather of the Augustan lawyer Ateius Capito, whose compliment to Ateius Philologus is reported at the beginning of T1. Ateius Philologus' numerous writings are known to have included a *liber glossematorum* (Festus 192) and an essay *an amauerit Didun Aeneas* (Julius Romanus *ap.* Charis. 162.6–7). He may be the L. Ateius listed in Pliny, *nat.* 1, among the sources for book 3, and is certainly included (as Ateius Philologus) among those for book 4 (T2). The apparent difficulty of his conflicting advice to Sallust and Pollio may reflect unfairness on Pollio's part, or Ateius' capacity to suit his advice to its recipient.

It is unknown whether the *breuiarium* composed for Sallust achieved any wider publication.

Of the surviving fragments F1 is the only one with any claim to derive from a historical work, and even this is far from certain.

(CJS)

52

M. Terentius Varro

Editions: Peter 2. xxxii–xl; 9–25.

Principal discussions: F. Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3 (Leipzig, 1877), 419–505; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 137–284; H. A. Sanders, 'The Annals of Varro', *AJPh* 23 (1902), 28–45; O. Leuze, 'Das synchronistische Kapitel des Gellius (Noct. Att. XVII 21)', *RhM* 66 (1911), 237–74; Cichorius, *RS* (1922), 189–241; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 555–78; H. Dahlmann, 'M. Terentius (84) Varro', *RE* Suppl. 6 (1935), 1172–277; H. Dahlmann, 'Varro de sua vita ad Libonem', *Philologus* 97 (1948), 365–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 268–70; H. J. Bäumerich, *Über die Bedeutung der Genealogie in der römischen Literatur* (diss. Cologne, 1964), 12–15, 41–62; F. Della Corte, *Varrone: il terzo gran lume romano* (2nd edn., Florence, 1970); K. G. Sallmann, *Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro* (Berlin and New York, 1971), 245–52; H. Dahlmann, 'Varroniana', *ANRW* 1.3 (1973), 3–25; P. Toohey, 'Politics, prejudice and Trojan genealogies: Varro, Hyginus and Horace', *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 5–28.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Less is known of Varro's life than is commonly supposed:[1] even Jerome's date for his birth (116 BC) is not beyond question.[2] Whether or not Augustine correctly states that he was born at Rome, he had close connections with Reate, belonged to its tribe, and appears as a native of that town in Symm. *epist.* 1.2.2.[3] We have no information about his childhood or upbringing,[4] and although he seems to have claimed descent from the consul of 216, whose reputation he probably sought to vindicate (F6), his relationship to the other Terentii Varrones active in the late republic remains unknown.

His earliest attested public office was as *triumuir capitalis*, probably in the late 90s.[5] His quaestorship is generally dated to 86 or 85 on the assumption that F478 Astbury = 476 Cèbe of his Menippean satire *Sesqueulixes* (Non. 86M = 122L: 'I remained continuously on active service; then led my nag back to the censor') refers to Varro himself in genuinely autobiographical mode and records his surrender of his public

[1] The standard discussion by Cichorius (*RS* 189–226) requires some revision.

[2] Hieron. *chron.* 147. See R. Helm, *Philologus* Suppl. 21.2 (1929), 23–4; R. W. Burgess, *AHB* 16 (2002), 31 (with different conclusions and implications for the dating of the *Hebdomades/Imagines* (Gell. 3.10.17), *Res rusticae* (*rust.* 1.1.1), and perhaps *Disciplinae* (Pliny *nat.* 29.65)).

[3] Augustine: *ciu.* 4.1; R. Astbury, *Latomus* 36 (1977), 180–1. Reate: Varro *rust.* 2 praef. 6; 2.2.9; Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1173. Tribe: Cichorius, *RS* 191. See further F5 with comm.

[4] There are no grounds for attributing to Varro the Catonian upbringing claimed by a speaker in the *Catus uel de educandis liberis* (Non. 108M = 155L (F19 Riese)), despite e.g. H. Dahlmann, *Gnomon* 17 (1941), 174–5; T. P. Wiseman, *Remembering the Roman People* (Oxford, 2009), 98 n. 83.

[5] Gell. 13.12.6 with Cichorius, *RS* 200–1 (cf. 220–1, suggesting also service in the Social War and tenure of the military tribunate).

horse after entry to the senate.[6] Both assumptions are uncertain,[7] and a character named 'Odysseus and a half' ought not perhaps to be taken entirely seriously.

At some point prior to a (perhaps fictitious) sojourn in Epirus during the pirate campaign of 67 BC Varro claims to have visited Liburnia (*rust.* 2.10.8). If this was the occasion on which he also observed local customs in Illyricum (ibid. 9; cf. 7),[8] that seemingly excludes Badian's supposition that he served as Cinna's quaestor, in charge of the advance contingent sent to Liburnia in 84, since that was soon withdrawn.[9] Alternatively, Cichorius suggested that Varro served as legate to C. Cosconius in the latter's campaign against the Delmatae, some way south of Liburnia.[10] However, Eutr. 6.4 (whence, or more probably from a common Livian source, Oros. 5.23.23) apparently dates Cosconius' command from 78 to at least the end of 77, whereas Varro must have been in Rome in summer/autumn 77 if he wrote an *Ephemeris* for Pompey in anticipation of the latter's journey to Spain to confront Sertorius (*Itin. Alex. M.* 6). Various resolutions are possible: Varro's term as Cosconius' legate may have been unusually brief, Cosconius' command or the *Ephemeris* may be misdated,[11] or Varro may have served in another unattested campaign in this area.[12]

Varro *rust.* 3.16.10 attests that he served in some military capacity in Spain prior to 50 BC. This may well have been under Pompey in the war against Sertorius, but the coin still often adduced to demonstrate it (*RRC* 447) belongs to another date, another Varro, and another context.[13] Likewise, *rust.* 3.12.7, universally adduced to show that Varro spent 'many years' in Spain and so served throughout the Sertorian campaign, may in fact concern not Varro (always elsewhere explicitly identified when he is the addressee in the *Res rusticae*: 1.2.7; 2.5.13; 10.8; 3.3.8; 5.8; 17.4) but Q. Axius, the principal addressee of the speakers in *Res rusticae* 3 and, as here, the butt of his companions' banter.[14]

If Varro was not serving almost continuously as a legate from 78 to 71, this has some bearing on the possible dates of his tribunate (Gell. 13.12.6), praetorship (Themist. 34.8, p.453 Dind.; cf. App. *b.c.* 4.47.202), and provincial governorship (implied by *ling.* 7.109), but it is impossible to be more specific. Cichorius

[6] Cichorius, *RS* 219–20; cf. 224–5 for further unwarranted inferences from this satire.

[7] Cf. H. Hill, *CQ* 26 (1932), 175; C. Nicolet, *L'Ordre équestre* 2 (Paris, 1974), 1032.

[8] How far this claim to autopsy can be trusted is perhaps open to question. The item recorded in *rust.* 2.10.9 had earlier featured (with specific reference to Liburnia) in Posidonius F269 Edelstein–Kidd (=Strabo 165), based, he says, on the eyewitness evidence of his host, Charmeleon of Massilia (cf. also [Arist.] *mir. ausc.* 91; Diod. 4.20.2–3; Aelian *anim.* 7.12 (if Jacobs' correction of *Αἰγυπτίων* to *Λιγυστίων* is accepted)).

[9] Badian, *Studies*, 230. Cinna: App. *b.c.* 1.77.354–78.358; cf. Livy *per.* 83; *vir. ill.* 69.

[10] Cichorius, *RS* 191–3. On Cosconius see R. Syme, *The Provincial at Rome* (Exeter, 1999), 166–8.

[11] If the *Ephemeris* is the *Ephemeris naualis* of Non. 713M=991L (Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1252–3; *contra*: Della Corte, *Varrone*[2] (1970), 53 n. 12), the eve of Pompey's pirate campaign offers a more plausible context.

[12] For this possibility cf. Sall. *hist.* 2.40M. with J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (London, 1969), 35 n. 6 (despite M. Š. Kos, *Appian and Illyricum* (Ljubljana, 2005), 312, Sallust could refer to a foray into the border territory of the Iapodes from a base in Liburnia). Nor, despite Cichorius, *RS* 192, can we entirely exclude the possibility that Varro had already visited Liburnia during the pirate campaign (cf. Cic. *Man.* 35 for operations on the Illyrian coast; Caes. *BCiv.* 3.5.3 for later Liburnian support for Pompey).

[13] See Crawford, *RRC* 1. 89–92. The occasion and reference of Sall. *hist.* 2.69M, even if it concerns our Varro, are beyond rational conjecture.

[14] See Keil on *rust.* 3.13.1.

reasonably supposed that Varro would not have sought the tribunate during the period in which holders were debarred from higher office, but that still leaves open the possibility of a tenure in the late 80s or after 75.[15] The praetorship cannot be earlier than 76 (if he was born in 116) and probably pre-dates Varro's service as a legate to Pompey in the pirate war of 67,[16] even though not all such legates were of praetorian or higher rank.

Varro himself attests his service in the pirate campaign, and there is no reason to doubt that he was (exceptionally) awarded the *corona naualis*, even if the circumstances remain unknown.[17] Varro may also have continued to serve as a legate during Pompey's Mithridatic command and have owed to such service much of the wealth that later attracted the pointed envy of D. Brutus.[18] His service on Caesar's agrarian commission, despite his possible initial opposition to the so-called First Triumvirate in 59, may then have enabled him to reward men who had served under him.[19]

Despite his close friendship with Pompey (going back perhaps to 77 or earlier) and extensive military service, the consulship clearly lay beyond Varro's reach and Pompey preferred to promote other candidates.[20] In late 50 BC, however, with civil war looming, Pompey called on Varro to join Afranius and Petreius in Spain as his legate.[21] Even Caesar's account of Varro's actions whilst in charge of Further Spain in the campaign of 49 (*BCiu.* 1.38.1–2; 2.17.1–20.8) does not conceal his success in raising money, ships, supplies, and men, the impossible situation in which he was placed by the defeat of Afranius and Petreius, or his scrupulous adherence to propriety at his eventual surrender. Varro's loyalty to Pompey led him to rejoin his commander in northern Greece, but he took no active part in the Pharsalus campaign and subsequently made his peace with Caesar, with whom he had already established a

[15] Cf. also F. X. Ryan, *Hommages à Carl Deroux* (Brussels 2002), 2. 378–9; Cichorius, *RS* 202; T. P. Wiseman, *Remembering the Roman People* (Oxford, 2009), 11.

[16] Wiseman, o.c. 113–15.

[17] Pirate campaign: Varro *rust.* 2 praef.6; cf. Pliny *nat.* 3.101; Florus 1.41.10; App. *Mithr.* 95.435. *Corona naualis*: Pliny *nat.* 7.115; 16.7; perhaps Fest. 156; V. A. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army* (London, 1981), 75, against P. Steiner, *BJ* 114 (1906), 36–7. Cf. Coarelli's speculative identification of a heroic statue from Casinum as portraying Varro and commemorating this exploit, performed as a *praefectus classis* (in G. C. Manasse, E. Roffia (eds.), *Splendida Civitas Nostra. Studi archeologici in onore di Antonio Frova* (Rome, 1995), 269–80; cf. id., *Ktema* 17 (1992), esp. 105–7).

[18] Mithridatic command: *MRR* 2. 156 with n. 4; J. E. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar* (Copenhagen, 1968), 96–7; Sallmann, *Geographie des älteren Plinius* (1971), 245 with n. 27 (against Cichorius, *RS* 194–6). Wealth: D. Brutus *ap.* Cic. *fam.* 11.10.5 (despite J. O. Thompson, *CR* 6 (1956), 2–3); Skydsgaard, o.c. 99; I. Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* (Brussels, 1975), 333, 400–1.

[19] Agrarian commission: Varro *rust.* 1.2.10; Pliny *nat.* 7.176. Initial opposition: App. *b.c.* 2.9.33 with R. Astbury, *CQ* 17 (1967), 403–7; *contra*, T. P. Wiseman, *Remembering the Roman People* (Oxford, 2009), 117.

[20] Nothing suggests that Varro achieved any distinction as an orator, although he left three books of *suasiones* and twenty-two of *orationes* (cf. T1 with e.g. Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3 (1877), 433–6).

[21] Legate: Caes. *BCiu.* 1.38.1; 2.17.2; Livy *per.* 110; Suet. *Iul.* 34.1 (49 BC). The date is implied by Cic. *fam.* 9.13.1 and by Varro's presence in Rome at the dramatic date of book 3 of the *res rusticae* (midsummer 50 BC: see E. Badian, *Athenaeum* 48 (1970), 4–6; J. Linderski, *Roman Questions* (Stuttgart, 1995), 100–6; 637–8; *Roman Questions II* (Stuttgart, 2007), 328 n. 10, 612–13). Cic. *Att.* 5.11.3 suggests that Varro was in Rome in summer 51. The evidence and intrinsic probability show that he cannot have served initially as a mere proquaestor in Spain (as e.g. L. Amela Valverde, *Hispania Antiqua* 25 (2001), 106, so interpreting *RRC* 447).

connection before the civil war (Caes. *BCiu.* 2.17.2) and who, perhaps in 46, gave him charge of his projected public library at Rome.[22]

After Caesar's murder, Varro's retirement from political engagement, which he perhaps justified in a preface to book 4 of the *De uita populi Romani* (cf. Non. 284M= 438L (F124 Rip.=438 Salv.)), did not provide immediate protection. In 44 Antony took possession of his villa at Casinum which he claimed to have purchased under Caesar and may have been the moving force behind Varro's proscription in 43.[23] Saved, however, by his friendship with Antony's associate Q. Fufius Calenus, Varro apparently lived out his remaining years untroubled until his death, in 28 BC according to Jerome.[24]

Works

Jerome's avowedly incomplete catalogue of Varro's works (T1)[25] testifies to their prodigious volume and range, unparalleled in Latin letters. So far as his output can be dated with any certainty, the *Menippean Satires* seem to have dominated his production in the early part of his career, when his time was largely taken up with political and military responsibilities, whilst most or all of his major works on Roman antiquities and the Latin language belong after Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus.[26] A major doubt concerns the dating of his most important antiquarian works, the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* and the *Antiquitates rerum diuinarum*. It is clear that the former preceded or were published at the same time as the latter (cf. Aug. *ciu.* 6.4) but there is no decisive evidence for their date.[27] The *Antiquitates rerum diuinarum* were dedicated to Caesar as Pontifex Maximus and are commonly assumed to belong to the period of his dictatorship, but nothing excludes the possibility that they and/or the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* were published in the late 50s BC.[28]

Whatever the date of publication of the *Antiquitates*, however, their conception must have preceded it by several years, and it is likely that Varro had been assembling material, in the form of excerpts, for these and other works from a very early date.[29]

[22] Suet. *Iul.* 44.2; cf. Isid. *orig.* 6.5.1; N. Horsfall, *BICS* 19 (1972), 122.

[23] Villa: Cic. *Phil.* 2.103–5; A. Garzetti, *Atti congr. int. studi Varroniani* (Rieti, 1976), 1. 99–100. Proscription: Varro *ap.* Gell. 3.10.17 (plundering of library); App. *b.c.* 4.47.202–3; Dio 47.11.3.

[24] Hieron. *chron.* 164 (*not* 27 BC: cf. Helm, *Philologus* Suppl. 21.2 (1929), 23–4). See F. Coarelli, *REL* 75 (1997), 92–112 for a conjectural identification of Varro's tomb (at Casinum).

[25] The contents, and therefore the reference in the Latin title, of a number of these works are uncertain (and hence also the appropriate English translation). The errors and inconsistencies in the MSS on the number of books of the *Antiquitates* and *De lingua Latina* have been left unaltered in T1.

[26] Cf. Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3, esp. 495 n. 11; Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1178; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 96–7, 235–6.

[27] Cf. N. Horsfall, *BICS* 19 (1972), 120–1. Cic. *Planc.* 58 (54 BC) might imply that the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* were not then published and Varro's reputation secured, although their subject matter did not cover the precise topic of Cicero's concern here.

[28] So L. R. Taylor, *CPh* 29 (1934), 228 with n. 16; cf. H. D. Jocelyn, *BRL* 65 (1982), 164–77. The traditional view and date are reasserted by Y. Lehmann, *REL* 64 (1986), 92–103; T. Tarver in A. H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Religion and Superstition in Latin Literature* (Bari, 1995), 42–8, but without conclusive argument.

[29] On Varro's working methods see esp. J. E. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar* (Copenhagen, 1968), esp. 64–88, 101–16.

He had himself studied under the scholarly L. Aelius Stilo, whom he frequently cites, dedicated an early work, probably that on the alphabet, to the scholar-poet Accius,[30] and prided himself on his punctilious attention to traditional practice in office (Gell. 13.12.6). Whilst his preoccupation with the threatened or actual loss of Rome's past, traditional values, and identity undoubtedly represents a reaction, by a man of profoundly conservative outlook, to what he saw as a deep contemporary crisis, that perception was probably forged early in his career rather than as a specific response to the events of the mid-first century.

Varro's works graphically illustrate the increasing diversity of formats in which the results of historical enquiry could be presented in Latin. The *Hebdomades* or *Imagines*, for example, was an innovative collection of 700 portraits of Greek and Roman political, military, and cultural figures, each accompanied by a brief epigram and, in some cases at least, by a short scholarly commentary in prose.[31] Published when Varro was 77 (39 BC?),[32] the work, perhaps for the first time, systematically placed distinguished Romans on a par with their non-Roman, principally Greek, counterparts, a practice to be mirrored in Nepos' *De uiris illustribus* of this same period and reflecting Varro's consistent focus on Rome and Roman identity, not least in relation to the Greek world.[33]

That preoccupation was manifested above all in the *De gente populi Romani* ('On the Ancestry of the Roman People'), a work in four books published in or soon after 43 BC.[34] In this Varro set the origins of the Roman people in the broader context of the development of human (again predominantly Greek) civilization since the flood of Ogygus, mirroring the growing interest in 'universal history' that was prompted, at least in part, by Rome's renewed military engagement with the East and in particular the campaigns and conquests of Pompey.[35] This built on Greek predecessors, notably Dicaearchus, who traced the development of Greek civilization from its earliest origins, and the chronographer Castor of Rhodes, whose *Χρονικῶν Ἐπιτομή* ('Chronological Summary'), like Varro's treatise, went back to the late third millennium, at least alluded to Ogygus (*FGrHist* 250 F1; cf. perhaps F4; F7), emphasized that Hellenic culture was as old as that of the Near Eastern kingdoms,

[30] Stilo: Cic. *Brut.* 205 with Gell. 16.8.2; Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1173–4; L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 158. Accius: Priscian, *GL* 2.8; Pompeius, *GL* 5.98, 108 with Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3. 468–70.

[31] For testimonia and explicitly attested fragments see M. Salvadore, *M. Terenti Varronis fragmenta omnia quae extant. Pars I: Supplementum* (Hildesheim, etc., 1999), F106; 108–15. Cf. Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3. 452–3, 508–92; Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1227–9; Della Corte, *Varrone*[2], 190–6. On the possibility that 'barbarians' were included (as in Nepos) cf. J. Geiger, *CQ* 48 (1998), 308–9.

[32] Gell.3.10.17. The work was probably already in progress in 44 BC: see Cic. *Att.* 16.11.3 with D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *CQ* 12 (1962), 163–4.

[33] Cf. A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 96–7; Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 231. See also E. Norden, *Varro's Imagines* (Berlin, 1990), 23–5 on links with the ideology of Virg. *Aen.* 6.847–53; ibid. 9–28 for the influence of the *Imagines* on the parade of heroes in *Aeneid* 6 and on the Forum Augustum; further hypotheses in J. Geiger, *The First Hall of Fame* (Leiden and Boston, 2008), 44–6, 99–115.

[34] Arnob. 5.8=F9P. Fragments: P. Fraccaro, *Studi Varroniani* (Padua, 1907), 255–86; Peter 2. 10–24. Discussion: see esp. Fraccaro o.c.; Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1237–241.

[35] Cf. K. Clarke, *JRS* 87 (1997), 106; cad. in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, etc., 1999), 249–79.

and concluded with the year of Pompey's eastern triumph.[36] However, Varro gave the Roman people a central position as the heir to earlier cultural developments, tracing their borrowings from others and inheritance from the distant past and with an increasingly exclusive focus on Rome in the last two books. Likewise, the *De uita populi Romani* ('On the Life of the Roman People'), also in four books, certainly written between 49 and 32 BC and probably roughly contemporary with the *De gente populi Romani*, covered a wide range of Roman social, cultural, and political institutions from the regal period onwards, with some attention to political history (perhaps as a chronological framework), a clear emphasis on the ethico-political decline of the late republic, and possibly at least an attempt to interpret Rome's history on the biological model of childhood, youth, maturity, and senescence.[37]

Since both treatises were organized on a broadly chronological basis and implicitly at least set out an overriding thesis about the Roman past, they arguably merit a place here (and not merely the *De gente populi Romani* which Peter included). However, they should perhaps be seen primarily as developments out of Varro's earlier antiquarian writing (in particular the *Antiquitates*), especially as they exemplified his antiquarian interests and approach. In both, for example, Varro displays the same preoccupation with specific detail and employs the same techniques of enquiry and explanation that were on display in the *Antiquitates*.[38] Fragments of the *De uita populi Romani* (see esp. F24; 92 Rip. = F303; 418 Salv.) reveal the same systematizing treatment of material that dominated the *Antiquitates* (and Varro's output in general), and it is hard to see how the work's account of individual institutions (such as the rituals associated with marriage and childbirth in book 2: F78–81 Rip. = 389–91 Salv.) could have avoided an essentially synchronic approach. Something similar may have been true of the final part of the *De gente populi Romani* which dealt with Rome's early institutions. On this basis both works are generally categorized as antiquarian rather than historical, although they are perhaps better seen as particularly striking illustrations of the overlap (and artificiality of differentiating categorically) between 'antiquarian' and 'historical' writing.[39] In both Varro makes systematic what were at least occasional preoccupations in earlier historians (on whom he will certainly have drawn), and if

[36] For Varro's knowledge (and reworking) of Dicaearchus: cf. *rust.* 1.2.15–16; 2.1.3–9; B. Reischl, *Reflexe griechischer Kulturentstehungslehren bei augusteischen Dichtern* (diss. Munich, 1976), 88–7; T. J. Saunders in W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. Schütrumpf (eds.), *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation, and Discussion* (New Brunswick and London, 2001), 252–3; E. Schütrumpf, ibid. 256–260; W. Ax, ibid. 279–310 (cf. id., *RhM* 143 (2000), 337–69; id., *Text und Stil* (Stuttgart, 2006), 153–78). Castor: Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1240–1; T. Cole, *HSCPh* 102 (2004), 363–6. For an explicit citation of Castor in the *De gente populi Romani* cf. Aug. *civ.* 21.8 = F5 Fraccaro, *FGrHist* 250 F9; cf. also Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2B, 822 on *FGrHist* 250 F3; ibid. 826 on *FGrHist* 250 F8.

[37] Fragments: B. Riposati, *M. Terenti Varronis De Vita Populi Romani* (Milan, 1939), 280–316; M. Salvadore, *M. Terenti Varronis Fragmenta omnia quae extant Pars II. De vita populi Romani libri IV* (Hildesheim, etc., 2004). Discussion: Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1243–6; Riposati, o.c.; W. Ax, *RhM* 143 (2000), 337–69 (= id., *Text und Stil* (Stuttgart, 2006), 153–78); L. Deschamps in M. Courrént, J. Thomas (eds.), *Imaginaire et modes de construction du savoir antique* (Perpignon, 2001), esp. 101–4; N. Purcell, *AJPh* 124 (2003), 343–8.

[38] Detail: cf. esp. *De vita populi Romani* F1 Rip. = F283 Salv. with A. J. Stevenson in L. Holford-Strevens, A. Vardi (eds.), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius* (Oxford, 2004), 139. Techniques: P. Fraccaro, *Studi Varroniani* (Padua, 1907), 231–5; Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1243–4; L. Deschamps in M. Courrént, J. Thomas (eds.), *Imaginaire et modes de construction du savoir antique* (Perpignon, 2001), 91–4.

[39] Cf. J. Marincola in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography* (Leiden, etc., 1999), 307–8.

they are excluded here, that is as much for practical reasons as for their antiquarian characteristics. Likewise excluded are Varro's works on literary history (also developed out of Hellenistic models) and e.g. the biographical material on individual authors included in the *De poetis* ('On Poets').[40]

Problems of a different kind attend the *Legationes*, *Res urbanae*, and *De Pompeio*, all of which have been ascribed a historiographical character. The three books concerned with *legationes* have commonly been conceived (if with questionable plausibility) as an autobiographical account of Varro's own service as a *legatus*, written prior to the *De sua uita*. On this basis a number of fragments (and other material), particularly in the elder Pliny, have been attributed to the work, though none directly concerns Varro's own military actions or experience.[41] However, Dahlmann[42] has argued persuasively that the work in fact dealt with the rights, duties, etc. of *legati* (in the sense of both legates and envoys), a subject clearly of interest to Varro.[43] If Caesar's attribution to Varro in 49 of the statement that he was well aware of the duty of a *legatus* (*ciu.* 2.17.2) is a sardonic reference to the work, it pre-dated the civil war.

Peter included the *Res urbanae* ('City Matters') in *HRR*, but its contents are entirely obscure: conjectures include a history of the city of Rome, a survey of city trades, a chronicle of events in the city, or a topographical description of Rome.[44] The solitary attributed fragment, its own wording uncertain, is of little assistance.[45] It appears to reflect a comparatively positive account of Spartacus that implicitly denies claims that he had rightly been enslaved as a deserter from the Roman army and a brigand[46] and places at least some of the blame for his rising on Roman abuse and avarice. As such it may be a significant precursor, rather than reflection, of the portrayal of Spartacus in Sallust's *Histories* and later sources dependent on him.[47] Nonetheless, although Spartacus was presumably sold at Rome and supposedly later planned an attack on the capital,[48] the relevance of the fragment to the *Res urbanae* remains completely obscure, and hence it can offer no guidance to the character of the work.[49]

[40] Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1222–3; *Studien zu Varro 'De poetis'* (Mainz, 1963); Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 230

[41] See esp. Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3. 436–9; Sallmann, *Geographie des älteren Plinius* (1971), 245–52.

[42] *ANRW* 1.3. 15–6; cf. earlier Della Corte, *Varrone*[2] (1970), 245–6.

[43] Cf. *lng.* 5.87; 6.66; 7.41; *De uita populi Romani* ap. Non. 528M=848L (F76 Rip.=387 Salv.); Non. 529M=850L (F75; 93 Rip.=386; 419 Salv.); Non. 149M=217L (F92 Rip.=418 Salv.); N. Horsfall, *BICS* 19 (1972), 124.

[44] See Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1247–8; B. Riposati, *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 320. There is, however, no reason to doubt the existence of the work itself (as O. Gruppe, *Commentationes philologae in honorem Th. Mommsen* (Berlin, 1877), 541, supposing a confusion with the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*).

[45] Charis.170 (=Peter, *Rerum urbanarum libri III*, F1): Varro de rebus urbanis III: Spartaco innocente coniecto ad gl<adiatori>um (gl<adiatori>um *Keil* : gl * um *n* : gl<adiatorium lud>um *Niebuhr ap. Lindemann*): 'Varro in his third book on city matters: "when Spartacus, though guiltless, had been thrown to a gladiatorial show (?)".' Apart from the uncertainty about the supplement, *ad* rather than *in* after *coniecto* appears unparalleled.

[46] Cf. also Plut. *Crass.* 8.2. For the accusation see Florus 2.8.8. App. *b.c.* 1.116.539 is noncommittal.

[47] For which cf. e.g. A. La Penna, *Athenaeum* 41 (1963), 256–9; G. Stampacchia, *La tradizione della guerra di Spartaco* (Pisa, 1976), 29–34, 134–9.

[48] Florus 2.8.11; App. *b.c.* 1.117.545; Ampel. 45.3; cf. Plut. *Crass.* 11.1.

[49] Despite Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 237; G. Stampacchia, *La tradizione della guerra di Spartaco* (Pisa, 1976), 140–1, there is no substantive basis to Maurenbrecher's supposition (*C. Sallusti Historiarum reliquiae* 1 (Leipzig, 1891), 43–4) that Varro's *res urbanae* is the source of Pliny's notice on the prohibition on the possession of gold and silver in Spartacus' army (*nat.* 33.49; cf. App. *b.c.* 1.117.547).

Little is known also of the *De Pompeio* ('On Pompey'). If Ritschl is right in arguing that a full biography would have been named *De uita Pompeii* ('On the Life of Pompey'),[50] it was presumably a laudatory memoir of some kind: Varro was known as a writer of eulogies by 45 BC (Cic. *acad. post.* 8), including one of Porcia, sister of Cato and widow of the anti-Caesarian L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (Cic. *Att.* 13.48.2: August 45 BC). In either case, the work was most probably composed after Pompey's death. Though Varro was polite about Caesar and in the *De uita populi Romani* probably placed much of the blame for the civil war on the double-dealing of the tribune Curio and intransigence of the consuls of 49,[51] there is no evidence that he abandoned his republican principles or made particular efforts to ingratiate himself with Caesar or his heirs;[52] republicans feature prominently among the known honorands of his (post-45 BC) *Logistorici*,[53] and Appian (*b.c.* 4.47.202) may be right in supposing that he was proscribed as a man of republican sentiments in 43. A work in which, without denigrating Caesar, Varro honoured the memory of his friend is entirely feasible. Münzer (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 280–4) argued that some of the fragments of Varro in Pliny referring to Pompey's campaigns (*nat.* 6.51–2; 33.136; 37.11) and other similar material in the *Natural History*, including documentary evidence of Pompey's military exploits (*nat.* 3.18; 7.96–9; 37.12–16), were taken from the *De Pompeio*.[54] That is not implausible even if not strictly required to explain Pliny's high regard for Pompey,[55] but it remains hypothetical given the range of Varro's output and consequently the different contexts in which such material might appear: the citation in *nat.* 37.11, for example, may come from a discussion of the developing fashion for gemstones.

Three works remain that meet the criteria for inclusion of their fragments here: the *Annales*, *De familiis Troianis* ('On Trojan Families'), and the *De sua uita* ('On his Own Life'). As Ritschl observed, the restricted scale of the *Annales* (in three books) implies that this was a summary history like those of Nepos and Atticus.[56] Its date is unknown.[57] That Cicero does not refer to it (e.g. for details about the Athenian

[50] Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3. 436.

[51] Polite: Priscian *GL* 2.256=Funaioli F230; Ann. Cornut. ap. Cassiod. *orth.*, *PL* 70. 1241, Isid. *orig.* 1.27.15=Funaioli F269; cf. also the dedication of the *Antiquitates rerum diuinarum* (above) and the addressing to Caesar of perhaps an elaborate literary letter (Non. 56M=79L; 263M=402L; 423M=684L; H. Dahlmann, *MH* 7 (1950), 214–20). Civil war: Non. 147M=214–5L (*de uita p.R.* F117 Rip.= 428 Salv.); Non. 525M=844L (F116 Rip.=427 Salv.); cf. also the neutral tone of Non. 245M=368L (F118 Rip.=429 Salv.) on Caesar in 49.

[52] Cf. B. Zucchelli, *Atti congr. int. studi Varroniani* (Rieti, 1976), 2. 609–25; T. Baier, *EMC* 43 (1999), 351–67, against e.g. L. R. Taylor, *CPh* 29 (1934), 221–7; N. Horsfall, *BICS* 19 (1972), 125.

[53] H. Dahlmann in *Navicula Chilonensis* (Leiden, 1956), 117; B. Zucchelli, *Atti congr. int. studi Varroniani* (Rieti, 1976), 2. 622–3; id., *Varro Logistoricus* (Parma, 1981), 37–88, esp. 86–7. Date of *Logistorici*: M. G. Morgan, *MH* 31 (1974), 117–22.

[54] Cf. also the common hypothesis that Varro was a significant source for later accounts of the Sertorian War: so e.g. C. F. Konrad, *Plutarch's Sertorius* (Chapel Hill and London, 1994), xliii.

[55] Cf. P. Grenade, *REA* 52 (1950), 57–8 on Pompey's high status as a military conqueror in the early imperial period.

[56] Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3. 447–8.

[57] Against attempts to see a reference to it in Cic. *acad.* 1. 9 of 45 BC (Sanders, *AJPh* 23 (1902), 30; Leuze, *Röm. Jahrzählung*, 239–44; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 268) see e.g. K. Mras, *JAW* 143 (1909), 87–8; F. Franceschi, *Aevum* 28 (1954), 411–12; cf. comm. on Atticus 33 F2. The attempt of A. and Y. Lehmann (in Y. Lehmann, G. Freyburger, J. Hirstein (eds.), *Antiquité tardive et humanisme de Tertullien à Beatus Rhenanus. Mélanges offerts à François Heim à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (Turnhout, 2005), 261–73)

embassy of 155 BC: *Att.* 12.23.2) may mean only that he did not expect to find there the information he required, but in its presumed primary focus on a chronological résumé of Roman history it is perhaps closest to the *De uita populi Romani*, with at least some shared material, and it may be a work of the same period (late 40s BC?).

Also uncertain is the scope of the work, although F1 probably implies that it included the regal period, and it presumably went down to Varro's own day. Further assistance might be gleaned from Gell. 17.21, in which Gellius offers a synchronistic sketch of Greek and Roman history (cultural, political, and military) based explicitly on excerpts 'from books that are called *chronici*' (17.21.1). One of these was clearly Nepos' *Chronica* (cf. ibid. 3; 8), and it is plausible to suppose that the citation of Varro in 17.21.24 (F2) likewise derives from his *Annales*.[58] Moreover, Leuze established that Gellius also draws other data in this chapter from a source that used the 'Varronian' chronology,[59] raising the possibility that these items also derive from the *Annales*. This inference is not secure, but it is preferable to the supposition that Gellius here uses, at least in part, an author such as Atticus whom he never names.[60] If the *Annales* are Gellius' source for the 'Varronian' material, they certainly included: the battles of Salamis and the Cremera (12–13); the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War and synchronization with the dictatorship of A. Postumius Tubertus (16–17); the *akme* of the mathematician Eudoxus, defeat of the Spartans at Corinth, execution of Manlius Capitolinus, and birth of Aristotle (23–5); the accession of Philip (28);[61] and the start of the First Punic War (40). Leuze's analysis would add a variety of other Greek and Roman cultural and political data to this list. That the author of the *Hebdomades* should, like Nepos and Atticus, have included such a range of Roman and Greek material occasions no surprise. However, the supposition, though plausible, remains unproven.

Similarly unproven is the attribution of other Varronian citations to the *Annales*, such as his account of the military exploits and honours of Siccius Dentatus (Val. Max. 3.2.24; Fulgent. *serm.ant.* 5).[62] The *Annales* will certainly, however, have demonstrated the same readiness to depart from historical orthodoxy apparent, for example, in Varro's dating of the institution of the tribunate to 449 BC and recording of the tradition that the Gauls captured the Capitol in 390.[63] In this, and in extending the potential scope of the *Annales*, he will have been assisted by the sources at his disposal. Amongst the Roman historians his surviving works and fragments show

to revive Klotz's attribution of the catalogue (T1) to the *Imagines* of *c.*39 BC (*Hermes* 46 (1911), 1–17) and hence the *Annales* and *De vita sua* before that date (and the *De familiis Troianis* after it) founders on the highly questionable assumptions required (e.g. on the dating of the *De poetis*, *Res rusticae*, and *Disciplinae*) and on the explicitly incomplete character of Jerome's list.

[58] Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3. 449 n. 2.

[59] Leuze, *RhM* 66 (1911), 237–74; cf. E. Fantham, *LCM* 6.1 (1981), 7–11. Against the objections of E. Castorina, *Scritti minori* (Catania, 1979), 111–12 see G. D'Anna, *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 332 n. 3.

[60] As G. D'Anna, *ArchClass* 25–6 (1973–4), 172–86; *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 331–47; cf. Leuze, *RhM* 66 (1911), 272–3 (agnostic).

[61] See G. D'Anna, *ArchClass* 25–6 (1973–4), 166–7 n. 2.

[62] As H. Peter, *NJPhP* 125 (1882), 108–9; H. A. Sanders, *AJPh* 23 (1902), 32–45; *contra*: K. Mras, *JAW* 143 (1909), 88–90; cf. also A. Klotz, *Klio* 33 (1940), 173–9.

[63] Tribunate: *ling.* 5.81 with S. Mazzarino, *Helikon* 11–12 (1971–2), 110–18. Capitol: Non. 498M = 800L (*De uita populi Romani* F61 Rip. = 378 Salv.) with O. Skutsch, *JRS* 68 (1978), 93; N. Horsfall, *CJ* 76 (1980–1), 300.

particular knowledge of Cato, Piso, Sisenna, and Valerius Antias.[64] Varro was also, however, familiar with a range of lesser-known antiquarian and other works (including poetry) that could have contributed novel data or versions to his work, and he showed a similar wide knowledge in Greek.[65] Whether overall that gave his *Annales* a greater claim to credence is doubtful: an author who can apparently accept Antias' figure of 527 for the Sabine women and his misdating of the *ludi saeculares* to 146 does not inspire confidence.[66]

No date is attested for the *De familiis Troianis* but, as well as responding to the more general interest among some of the elite in asserting a legendary ancestry in the late republic,[67] it may more specifically reflect (and itself privilege and reinforce) the new centrality given to Rome's Trojan origins under Caesar's dictatorship and evinces at the level of individual *gentes* the preoccupation with Rome's legendary (and especially Trojan) ancestry evident in the *De gente populi Romani*. A date in the mid-to-late 40s is therefore plausible.[68] Toohey supposes that it was written specifically at Caesar's behest to support the Julii's own Trojan ancestry and justify Caesar's elevation of other families to the patriciate by conferring on them a similar Trojan origin.[69] However, there is no clear and consistent correlation between claimed Trojan ancestry and patrician status or more specifically between Trojan descent and the Alban families supposedly admitted to the patriciate under Tullus Hostilius, despite Dionysius' assertion (1.85.3) that those who then migrated to Rome included all the aristocratic households of Trojan origin. This suggests that although assertions of an Alban and patrician ancestry might also include a Trojan origin, they did not necessarily do so, and that at least some claims to Trojan descent developed or were created independently, without reference to any such ancestry. The plebeian Memmii may have asserted their Trojan origins long before Varro,[70] and the families so dignified by Virgil (*Aen.* 5.116–23) include not only them but the plebeian Cluentii: there are no grounds for supposing that either *gens* was elevated by Caesar (or Augustus),[71] and plebeian *gentes* had no less a need of a fabricated legendary ancestry that linked them

[64] Cato: see esp. *rust.* 1.2.7; 2.3.3; 2.4.11 (=Cato 5 F46a, 47, 48). Piso: *ling.* 5.148–9, 165; *rust.* 2.1.9; cf. Serv (auct.) *Aen.* 10.76 (=Piso 9 F8, 1, 46). Sisenna: *ling.* 8.73 (Sisenna 26 F136a); cf. the Logistoricus 'Sisenna uel de historia' (Gell. 16.9.5=Sisenna 26 T18); also Lyd. *mag.* 3.74 (=Sisenna 26 F143). Antias: comm. on Antias 25 F21; below, n. 66. Further conjectures in Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 177–250, 288–90.

[65] As in the *De gente populi Romani*, Castor's chronography would be particularly helpful for Graeco-Roman synchronisms if he regularly included consuls (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2B. 815), despite the uncertainties about his republican chronology.

[66] Sabine women: DH 2.47.4 (cf. Plut. *Rom.* 14.7=Antias 25 F5). *Ludi saeculares*: Censor. 17.11=Antias 25 F64 with comm.

[67] Wiseman, *Roman Studies*, 207–14; K.-J. Hölkeskamp in G. Vogt-Spira, B. Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität* (Stuttgart, 1999), 3–21 (=id., *Senatus Populusque Romanus* (Stuttgart, 2004), 199–217); C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan* (Cambridge, 2006), 32–44.

[68] So Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6. 1241–2. Della Corte's location of the work *c.*68 BC (*Varrone*[2] (1970), 252–4) depends on an unproven and improbable supposition that its omission from Jerome's catalogue (T1) implies an early date. For *familia* used in the sense of *gens* see Th. Mommsen, *De Collegiis et Sodaliciis Romanorum* (Kiel, 1843), 13 with n. 23; *TLL* 6.1.241.60–70, 244.18–66; but note DH 1.85.3 (n. 76) on Trojan 'households'.

[69] P. Toohey, *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 7–8.

[70] *RRC* 313 (with Crawford ad loc.); 349; Lucr. 1.1–43. *Contra*, J. Perret, *Les Origines*, 574–5.

[71] Cf. C. Heiter, *De patriciis gentibus* (diss. Berlin, 1909), 40–55. Descendants of Cluentii achieve distinction in the Augustan period only through the female line: M. Silvestrini, *CCG* 7 (1996), 270–1.

with the origins of Rome than their patrician counterparts, particularly where recent distinction of office was lacking.[72] Moreover, despite their presumed elevation to the patriciate by Caesar,[73] the Antonii firmly adhered to their supposed descent from Hercules, not Aeneas, and the one surviving fragment of the *De familiis Troianis* (F3) implicitly rejects the Caesarian account of the Palladium (see comm. ad loc.).

Which lineages beyond the Nautii (and presumably the Julii) Varro included we do not know, but it is commonly and plausibly supposed that both Virgil and Servius drew on him for the Trojan origin of the Memmii, Sergii, Cluentii, and Geganii, if not also the Atii.[74] Varro may also be the ultimate source of Festus' similar account of the Nautii (164; Paul. Fest. 165), though we cannot be sure what precise form that took (cf. F3 comm.), and the same may be true of the Aemilii, Caecilii, and/or Cloelii to whom Verrius also attributed Trojan forebears.[75] There is no evidence for any of these families (other than the Julii and perhaps the Memmii) claiming Trojan descent prior to Varro. However, this may simply reflect the deficiencies of our sources. Eulogists of families and individuals, in Latin as well as Greek (and including Varro himself), may already have exploited such possibilities, and Cicero's constant use of the Homeric tag (*Il.* 6.442; 22.105) 'I fear the Trojans' (*Att.* 2.5.1; 7.1.4; 7.12.3; 8.16.2; 13.13.2; cf. 13.24.1) when referring to noble conservative republicans would have particular point if there was a developing interest in such claims in this period.[76]

Nonetheless, there must be a strong suspicion that the Trojan ancestry of some, if not most, *gentes* was Varro's own scholarly creation, particularly for those that had long declined into insignificance (or died out entirely). His own interest in the Aeneas legend was long-standing and evidenced in a number of his works;[77] and he could no doubt draw on Greek heroic poetry and on Greek treatises that concerned themselves with legendary or specifically Homeric prosopography. As with Rome itself in the *De gente populi Romani*, the evident preoccupation with legendary heroic ancestors located the origins of Roman aristocratic families firmly within the traditions and world-view of Greek genealogical writing. Whether Varro incorporated the later history of these *gentes* we do not know, although the fact that the work occupied more than one book (F3) implies something beyond a summary treatment. Like Messalla Rufus, he showed an interest in practices specific to particular lineages or sub-lineages,[78] but such material could have featured elsewhere in his writing.

[72] Cf. Ö. Wikander, *OR* 19 (1993), 80; K.-J. Hölkeskamp in G. Vogt-Spira, B. Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität* (Stuttgart, 1999), 13, 17–20 (=id., *Senatus Populusque Romanus* (Stuttgart, 2004), 109, 212–16).

[73] C. Heiter, *De patriciis gentibus* (diss. Berlin, 1909), 5, 40.

[74] Virg. *Aen.* 5.116–23; Serv. *Aen.* 5.117, 121. But note Wiseman, *Roman Studies*, 211.

[75] Paul. Fest. 22, 38, 48. See, however, I. 388.

[76] Cf. also e.g. E. Zevi, *MDAI(R)* 104 (1997), 95 n. 49 (Acilii Glabriones); 99 (Aemilii); K.-J. Hölkeskamp in G. Vogt-Spira, B. Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität* (Stuttgart, 1999), 7–8, 13–15 (=id., *Senatus Populusque Romanus* (Stuttgart, 2004), 202–3; 209–10) (uncritical); M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis* (Heidelberg, 1999), 176–7, esp. 177 n. 568; A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2001), esp. 21–3. DH 1.85.3 asserts that about fifty households of Trojan origin still survived in his day, but whether that reflects the scope of Varro's work is most uncertain: cf. J. Poucet, *MEFRA* 101 (1989), 73.

[77] E. Cauer, *JbKPh* Suppl. 15 (1887), 144–7; Fraccaro, *Studi Varroniani* (Padua, 1907), 208–13; Y. Lehmann in G. Freyburger, L. Pernot (eds.), *Du héros païen au saint chrétien* (Paris, 1997), 47–51.

[78] Pliny *nat.* 19.8 (Atilii Serrani); cf. 33.21 with Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 353 (Quinctii). Trojan ancestry is asserted of neither family.

Varro's autobiography (*De sua uita*), in three books, must have been written after he supposed his public career to be finished, but its general attribution to his extreme old age is unwarranted. That would be true if, as Ritschl tentatively surmised, it is the (ultimate) source of Jerome's catalogue (T1), since that includes the *Res rusticae* of *c.*37 BC and the *Disciplinae* of probably *c.*33 BC.[79] However, nothing supports such an assumption (especially as the catalogue includes the *De sua uita* itself), and other formats in which the catalogue could have appeared are readily envisaged, most obviously the learned letter, employed for this purpose by Pliny (*epist.* 3.5) as well as Jerome himself.[80]

The composition of such a work by an ex-praetor who, despite considerable military service and the award of the *corona nauali*s, had won no major successes in his own right was unprecedented. It may reflect the vanity implicit in Varro's known sensitivity to perceived slights (Cic. *Att.* 13.25.3) and the increasing recognition at Rome that intellectual figures were of significance as such (evident, for example, in Nepos' biographies), but we may perhaps surmise an apologetic purpose on Varro's part, concerned to vindicate his past services to Rome and loyalty to Pompey, particularly perhaps in response to Caesar's unflattering account of his actions in 49. If so, the autobiography might belong to any date from the mid-40s onwards, although Dahlmann's identification of it as the work dedicated to L. Scribonius Libo (see F5–6 comm.) would probably exclude most of the period 42–35 BC when Libo was with his son-in-law, Sextus Pompeius.

The *De sua uita* must certainly have focused primarily on Varro's career, but the search for potential fragments amongst those not explicitly credited to a specific work yields little return. Münzer identified a number of citations in Pliny as reflecting reminiscences of Varro himself (notably *nat.* 4.66; 7.13; 81; 176–7; 18.307; 33.136; 36.17), but as he acknowledged, none could be ascribed with any confidence to the autobiography, and most are clearly taken from a different context entirely.[81] The same is true of fragments preserved elsewhere where Varro could claim autopsy or personal knowledge,[82] and since none records action taken by Varro himself, we have not included them here.

(AD)

[79] Ritschl, *Opuscula Philologica* 3, 489–491; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 273 n. 3.

[80] On Varro's own *epistulae* and *epistolicae quaestiones* see esp. P. Cugusi, *RCCM* 9 (1967), 78–85.

[81] Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 275–80. Cf. above on the attempted attribution of some of this (and other) material to the *Legationes*.

[82] Arnob. 6.23; DS *Aen.* 3.349; Mart. Cap. 9.928; cf. also Solin. 11.6–7; S+DS *Aen.* 10.13.

53

Q. Dellius

Editions: Peter 2. lxviii–lxxi, 53–4; Jacoby *FGrHist* 197.

Principal discussions: W. Fabricius, *Theophanes von Mytilene und Q. Dellius als Quellen des Geographie des Strabon* (Diss. Strasbourg, 1888); G. Wissowa, 'Q. Dellius', *RE* 4 (1901), 2447–8; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 327; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 95–6; Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* 2. (1978), 51–4; L. Duret, 'Dans l'ombre des plus grands 1: Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l'époque augustéenne', *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1447–560, at 1536–7; C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (Cambridge, 1988), 28; E. Badian, *OCD*[4] (2012), 442; B. Kelly, 'Dellius, the Parthian campaign and the image of Mark Antony', *SLLRH* 14 (2008), 209–34.

INTRODUCTION

Life

First attested under Dolabella the proconsul of Syria in 43 BC, Dellius changed sides to Cassius and even offered to kill his former commander. He then joined Antony, subsequently transferring to Octavian, and was famously called the 'circus-jumper of the civil wars' by Messalla Corvinus (*desultor bellorum civilium*; T2; cf. Sen. *clem.* 1.10.1; Vell. 2.84.2 with Woodman's note ad loc.). He played an important diplomatic role, persuading Cleopatra to come to Antony on the Cydnus in her finery (T3). He arranged the restoration of Herod in 40 (Jos. *AJ* 14.394) and negotiated with Artaxes, king of Armenia, before Antony's expedition (Dio 49.39.2–3). Dellius was the recipient of Horace *Odes* 2.3; Nisbet and Hubbard describe the poem as 'recommending hedonism to a hedonist'; Dellius was also said to have written lascivious letters to Cleopatra (T2; Syme, *AA* 357, raised doubts about their authenticity), to have offered to procure Herod's kinsman Aristobulus for Antony (Jos. *AJ* 15.2.6), and to have been Antony's lover (Dio 49.39.2).

Work(s)

Dellius is described as a historian by Plutarch (T4), and his work is quoted by Strabo (F1), if Casaubon's emendation is accepted. This fragment suggests that the work was a first-hand account of Antony's Parthian campaign (Peter hazards the title '*Bellum Parthicum*'), and it may lie behind the detailed extant accounts we possess (Plut. *Ant.* 37–51; Dio 49.23–31). It is difficult to see how F2 would fit into a campaign narrative, however, and it must either indicate that Dellius' work had a wider scope as an autobiographical memoir, or derive from a different work altogether, perhaps, as Jacoby suggests (*FGrHist* IIB Kommentar, 623), an apologetic account of the author's change(s) of allegiance. Plutarch's remarkable description of

the first meeting of Antony and Cleopatra (*Ant.* 25–7) may also go back to Dellius, since he had arranged it (cf. Pelling, *Plutarch: Antony*, 28). He is almost certainly the ultimate source of Plutarch's account of the initial diplomatic contact, which is presented from Dellius' point of view and even purports to describe his thoughts (a key part of the text is reproduced as T3); but we cannot be certain that it comes from the history, rather than from another work by Dellius or indeed from a work by another author reporting his oral testimony (cf. Hirschfeld, *Kl. Schr.* 780–1).

Earlier scholars such as Peter assumed that the work was written in Latin, and this still seems likely to us; in our view there are insufficient grounds for Jacoby's contrary view that Dellius wrote his history in Greek (see further on F2).

(CJS)

54

Cornutus

Principal discussions: Cichorius, *RS* (1922), 261–7; G. Wissowa, rev. of Cichorius, *GGA* 186 (1924), 48–63, at 52; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 329; A. Stein, *PIR*[2] (1936), C34, 1507; J. Scheid, *Les Frères Arvales* (Paris, 1975), 35–40.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The historian Cornutus is known only from an entry in the *Suda* lexicon which combines two separate and mutually contradictory statements (T1). The first of these, deriving almost certainly from Aelian,[1] is an anecdote about a historian who was a contemporary and rival of Livy, while the second, probably from Hesychius, refers to the Neronian philosopher L. Annaeus Cornutus. This confusion of two different writers can be safely attributed to the compiler of the lexicon.[2] The historian Cornutus has been variously identified. According to Cichorius, he was C. Caecilius Cornutus, praetor in 57 BC and governor of Bithynia in 56.[3] Another possible candidate is M. Caecilius M.f. Cornutus, a member of the college of Arvales in 21–20 BC.[4] He was probably the son of the *praetor urbanus* of 43, who had taken charge after the deaths of the consuls at Mutina (Cic. *fam.* 10.12.3) but committed suicide when Octavian marched on the city (Appian, *b.c.* 3.92.381). This man was either a brother or, more probably, a first cousin, of C. Cornutus, the praetor of 57.[5]

There is good reason to suppose that M. Cornutus, the Arval Brother of 21–20 BC, was a man of letters; Cichorius suggested that it was he who edited and published an

[1] Aelian, fr. 83 Hercher=fr. 86 Domingo-Forasté.

[2] But note that before Cichorius' seminal study it was customary to attribute the quotations of Cornutus in the Berne scholia on Lucan (here F1–3) to a commentary on Lucan by L. Annaeus Cornutus, his former teacher. For a recent restatement of this view see M. Euzennat, F. Salviat, P. Veyne, 'Les Scholies bernoises de Lucain: César et Marseille antique', *Études classiques* (Aix-en-Provence) 3 (1968–70), 13–24.

[3] Cichorius, *RS* 264. On his career, F. Münzer, 'C. Caecilius (43) Cornutus' *RE* 3. 1200. He was tribune of the plebs in 61, when his optimate sympathies gained the approval of Cicero, who called him a *pseudocato* (*Att.* 1.14.6). He may be the C. Caecilius of Cic. *Flacc.* 89, and the anonymous praetor-designate of Cic. *Vat.* 38 (F. X. Ryan, *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996), 185–6). As praetor in 57 he helped secure Cicero's return from exile (*p. red. in sen.* 23). Governor of Bithynia-Pontus: B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*[2] (London, 1911), 497; *BM Cat., Bithynia* 21.

[4] *CIL* 6.32338. On this man: E. Groag, 'M. (Caecilius) (46) Cornutus', *RE* 3. 1200; *PIR*[2] 2. C34; Scheid, *Frères arvales* (1975), 34–40.

[5] Scheid, *Frères arvales* (1975), 35, with good arguments, and rightly rejecting the view of P. Willems, *Le Sénat de la république romaine* 1 (Louvain, 1878), 568, that M. Cornutus (pr. 43) was the son of C. Cornutus (pr. 57).

astrological work (a 'table of catasterisms') which his father had left unfinished at his death.[6] He is also almost certainly the Cornutus to whom Tibullus addressed two of his elegies (2.2–3), one of which celebrates his recent marriage and expresses hope for future offspring.[7] Scheid suggests that the marriage was to the poet Sulpicia, following an old tradition, going back to the Renaissance, that identified her lover Cerinthus with Cornutus.[8] However that may be, Cornutus was evidently closely linked to M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, Tibullus' patron and Sulpicia's uncle; Scheid makes the plausible suggestion that it was through Messalla's patronage that Cornutus obtained his place in the Arval college, despite his comparative youth and lack of distinction.[9]

The problem with identifying this Cornutus as the historian, however, is that his biographical profile does not easily fit the circumstances of T1. This text clearly implies that Cornutus and Livy held their readings at a time when Livy was still unknown, and therefore before the publication of his first books—that is, probably, in the years 30–27 BC.[10] At this date M. Cornutus would have been a relatively young man, in his late twenties or early thirties,[11] and although he was admittedly unmarried and childless (Tib. 2.2, referring to his marriage, dates from between 24 and 19 BC), it is hard to imagine him as a target for crowds of legacy-hunters.

The anecdote in T1 makes more sense if the historian was the elderly C. Caecilius Cornutus, the praetor of 57 BC, who must have been born in or before 97, and would therefore have been in his late sixties or early seventies when competing with Livy for an audience for his recitations. A literal reading of the evidence suggests, therefore, that the historian Cornutus is more likely to have been C. Caecilius Cornutus, as Cichorius suggested, than any of the other known Caecilii Cornuti. It is possible, however, that the anecdote originated as a malicious joke by someone who wanted to disparage the historical efforts of M. Cornutus, and, taking advantage of the fact that he was still unmarried in his thirties, suggested that his audience must have been motivated by hopes of a mention in his will. Although this option is perhaps less likely on balance, it certainly cannot be ruled out.

[6] Cichorius, *RS* 268, with an ingenious emendation of Charisius 261, accepted by Scheid, *Frères arvales* (1975), 37.

[7] Tib. 2.2. The wish was evidently granted: Cornutus was succeeded in the Arval college by his son (*CIL* 6.2023a: AD 14; 2023b: 20–1), who reached the praetorship but committed suicide in AD 24 when accused of funding the plot of Vibius Serenus (Tac. *ann.* 4.28.2, 30.2; *PIR*^{2} C 35).

[8] Cerinthus: *Corp. Tib.* 4.3, 5, 8, 11. The arguments are set out by Scheid, *Frères arvales* (1975), 38 n. 4; R. J. Ball, *Tibullus the Elegist* (Göttingen, 1983), 166; P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus, Elegies 2* (Oxford, 1994), xvi–xvii.

[9] Scheid, *Frères arvales* (1975), 35–6, suggesting that he would have been little more than 30 when he entered the college (cf. n. 11), and noting that all the other known Arvales were ex-consuls. Scheid plausibly suggests that Cornutus held the praetorship before 21 and possibly before 29 BC.

[10] Cichorius, *RS* 262. It may be that the earliest books were composed, and recitations from them delivered, earlier than this—perhaps before Actium: J. Bayet, *Tite-Live* 1 (Paris, 1940), xvii–xx; T. J. Luce, *TAPhA* 96 (1965), 209–40. It is also possible to bring forward the date of publication, but not by much: the latest possible date is 25 BC (Liv. 1.19.3, with Ogilvie ad loc.; Oakley, *Comm.* 1.109–10; see also l. 437 below).

[11] Scheid, *Frères arvales* (1975), 35, proposes that he was born around 60, and was approaching 18 when his father died in 43.

Work

The three fragments that Cichorius assembled from the Berne scholia on Lucan appear to show that Cornutus' work dealt with the second civil war—including the crossing of the Rubicon (F1) and the siege of Massilia (F2–3)—in considerable detail. To Cichorius (*RS* 266) Cornutus' knowledge of the ground and of subordinate commanders involved in the siege suggested that he had taken part, which is probable but not certain, and on the Caesarian side, which is unnecessary and less likely: the named subordinate commanders belong to both sides, and what we are told of C. Cornutus' political sympathies (n. 3) might suggest that if anything he fought with the republicans. If so, and if his work was written from a Pompeian viewpoint, we could surmise that Lucan found him a congenial source.

Besides the three explicitly attributed fragments, the Berne scholia may well preserve much else from Cornutus. In particular, Cichorius drew attention to another passage which continues the role of Parmeno, mentioned in F2, and gives a narrative summary of events: *Schol. Luc.* 3.524: *dux Graecorum Parmeno nauali bello aduersus Brutum fuit prima pugna, sed sequenti uictus hac qua apud Tauronescum dimicatum est, Hermon ei substitutus est, quia Parmeno prius rem male gessisset. hac pugna a Dirracio Lucius Nasidius auxilio <missus> Massiliensibus uictus Hispaniam petit* ('The Greek general Parmeno in a naval campaign against Brutus was victorious in the first engagement, but in the following one, which was fought at Tauronescum, was defeated. Hermon was appointed in his place because of Parmeno's previous failure. In this battle Lucius Nasidius who had been sent from Dyrrachium as a reinforcement to the Massiliotes was defeated and made for Spain').[12] Cichorius' attribution of this material to Cornutus is persuasive, but in accordance with our stated principles (I. 15–16) we have not included it among the fragments.

The size and scope of the work can only be guessed at. Whether it covered events before 49, whether it reached the end of the war, and if so whether it went on to deal with subsequent events cannot be known; the fact that the preserved fragments are all concerned with the civil war between Caesar and Pompey naturally reflects the interests of commentators on Lucan rather than those of Cornutus. Finally we may note Cichorius' telling but not conclusive argument that the work did not reach the death of Cicero, because Cornutus is not among the historians analysed in Seneca, *suas.* 6.14.

The fragments, if authentic verbal citations, do not suggest any stylistic accomplishment on the part of the author.

(BML)

[12] The legate (Livy *per.* 110) Brutus is D. Junius Brutus Albinus, praetor 45 (Broughton *MRR* 2. 267). Tauronescum, according to H. Usener, is Tauroentium, south-west of Massilia (R. J. A. Talbert, *Barrington Atlas of the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1998), 15 F 3). For L. Nasidius, attested in Caes. *BCiu.* 2.3–4, as *?praefectus classis* of Pompey, see Broughton *MRR* 2. 271.

55

Sulpicius Blitho

Editions: Peter 1^2. cccIxxix, 316.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 324; F. Münzer, 'Sulpicius (27) Blitho', *RE* 4A (1931), 744–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 261.

INTRODUCTION

Apart from the one fragment, the author is unknown, and not to be confused with Sulpicius Galba (no. 57). Schanz–Hosius plausibly suggest that Nepos took this reference directly from Atticus' *Liber annalis*, and it is conceivable, but entirely speculative, that Blitho's work was itself primarily concerned with chronology.

(CJS)

56

C. Asinius Pollio

Editions: Peter 2. lxxxiii–lxxxvii, 67–70.

Principal discussions: F.-A. Aulard, *De Asinii Pollionis Vita et Scriptis* (Paris, 1877), esp. 63–71; G. Thouret, 'De Cicerone, Asinio Pollione, C. Oppio Rerum Caesarianarum Scriptoribus', *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 324–46; J. H. Schmalz, *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Asinius Pollio* (2nd edn., Munich, 1880); P. Otto, 'Quaestiones Strabonianae', *LSKPh* Suppl. 11 (1889), 224–348; E. Wölfflin, 'Über die Latinität des Asinius Pollio', *ALLG* 6 (1889), 85–106; E. Schwartz, 'Appianus', *RE* 2.1 (1895), 216–37 (=id., *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber* (Leipzig, 1959), 361–93); P. Groebe, 'C. Asinius (25) Cn.f. Pollio', *RE* 2 (1896), 1589–602; E. Kornemann, 'Die historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio', *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 555–691; id., 'Pollios Geschichtswerk und Horaz, Carm. II 1', *Klio* 3 (1903), 550–1; R. Daebritz, 'Zu Asinius Pollio', *Philologus* 70 (1911), 267–73; E. Stein, *PIR*^{2} 1 (1933), 251–3, A 1241; Schanz–Hosius 2^1 (1935), 24–30; J. André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (Paris, 1949); C. Coulter, 'Pollio's history of the civil war', *Classical Weekly* 46 (1952), 33–6; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 94–5; F. Altheim, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* 2 (Baden-Baden, 1953), 106–30; Gabba, *Appiano* (1956); R. Häussler, 'Keine griechische Version der Historien Pollios', *RhM* 109 (1966), 339–55; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1 (1966), 397–407, 533–6 n. 475; B. Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio als Politiker und zeitkritischer Historiker* (diss. Münster, 1967), esp. 96–161; Gabba, *Appiani b.c. lib. V* (Florence, 1970), xxxvii–xl; Lebek, *Verba prisca* (1970), 136–46, 316–26; A. B. Bosworth, 'Asinius Pollio and Augustus', *Historia* 21 (1972), 441–73; Moles, *Comm.* (1979), esp. li–lxi; L. Havas, 'Asinius Pollio and the fall of the Roman republic', *ACD* 16 (1980), 25–36; G. Zecchini, 'Asinio Pollione: dall'attività politica alla riflessione storiografica', *ANRW* 2.30.2 (1982), 1265–96; C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch on the Gallic wars', *CB* 60 (1984), 88–103; M. Hose, *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1994), esp. 259–64; R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven and London, 1995), esp. 89–94; M. Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford, 1997); J. G. W. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (Cambridge, 1998); L. Canfora, *Giulio Cesare: il dittatore democratico* (Rome, 1999), esp. 158–65, 400–9; L. Morgan, 'The autopsy of C. Asinius Pollio', *JRS* 90 (2000), 51–69; Pelling, *Plutarch and History* (2002), 1–44; A. J. Woodman, 'Poems to historians: Catullus 1 and Horace, *Odes* 2.1', in D. Braund, C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Festschrift T. P. Wiseman* (Exeter, 2003), 196–216; M.-C. Ferriès, *Les Partisans d'Antoine* (Bordeaux, 2007), esp. 335–41; Pelling, *Plutarch, Caesar* (2011), 44–7.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Pollio (born *c.*76 BC) came from one of the wealthiest and most powerful families among the Marrucini in central Italy: the Marrucine commander Herius Asinius who fell fighting C. Marius in the Social War in 90 BC was almost certainly his

grandfather.[1] He first appears at Rome in the early-to-mid 50s as an acquaintance of Catullus and probably Cn. Helvius Cinna, when his elder brother may already have been launched on a political career.[2] He may well also be the Pollio who was active in promoting the interests of P. Lentulus Spinther (cos. 57) over the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes and made the acquaintance of Cicero in the process (if not before).[3] In 54 Pollio himself embarked on an eye-catching prosecution of C. Cato, probably for technical infringements in relation to his legislative proposals, perhaps specifically that to abrogate Spinther's provincial command.[4]

Pollio was already among Caesar's friends at the Rubicon when civil war broke out in 49 (Plut. *Caes.* 32.7). In a later apologetic account to Cicero (*fam.* 10.31.2) he claimed to have joined Caesar simply to ensure protection from one or more personal enemies, but his acquaintance with Caesar must go back at least to 50; and for men from his background Caesar's cause clearly offered better prospects of advancement.[5] Pollio first served under Curio in Africa: with an advance guard he secured Cato's peaceful withdrawal from Sicily, and Appian also records his unsuccessful efforts to evacuate survivors after Curio's catastrophic defeat.[6] He fought with Caesar at Pharsalus (F4(b)–(c)), but apparently returned to hold the tribunate in 47, well before the normal age,[7] and then saw further service with Caesar in Africa (46 BC) and probably Spain (45 BC). He also held the praetorship, probably in 45, one of the first unambiguous examples of such accelerated promotion under Caesar's patronage.[8]

Pollio served as governor of Hispania Ulterior, probably from the start of 44, and conducted a difficult rearguard campaign against the much larger forces of Sex. Pompeius until the latter's departure for Massalia.[9] Elsewhere events moved rapidly in late 44 and early 43, culminating in the defeat of Antony by the consuls and

[1] Date of birth: Tac. *dial.* 34.7 with Hieron. *chron.* 170 (AD 4); also Cat.12.9 (*puer*); for reservations see G. V. Sumner, *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 260–1. Grandfather: Livy *per.* 73; Vell. 2.16.1; App. *b.c.* 1.40.181; Eutr. 5.3.2.

[2] Catullus: poem 12. Cinna: Charis. 158; 171; A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford, 2007), 21. Elder brother: J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1982), 57, 69 with E. Badian, *ZPE* 55 (1984), 107–9.

[3] Spinther: Cic. *fam.* 1.6.1 (with the warnings of Syme, *RP* 2. 519, also on *fam.* 9.25.3 (50 BC)). Later friendship with Cicero: Cic. *fam.* 10.31.6 (43 BC); cf. *Att.* 12.38.2 (45 BC).

[4] Prosecution: Sen. *contr.* 7.4.7; Tac. *dial.* 34.7; cf. also Cic. *Att.* 4.15.4; 16.5; J. Linderski, *Roman Questions* (Stuttgart, 1995), 130–2 (with 640). Cato's proposal: Cic. *ad QF* 2.3.1 and 4; 2.5(4).3; *fam.* 1.5a.2; 5b.2; cf. comm. on Fenestella 70 F2.

[5] Cf. Syme, *RP* 1. 108; T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C.–A.D. 14* (Oxford, 1971), 8 n. 4. Service with Caesar in the last stages of the Gallic War (e.g. Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.30.2 (1982), 1267) cannot be excluded, but nothing demonstrates personal knowledge of Gaul by Pollio.

[6] Sicily: Plut. *Cato Min.* 53.2–4; App. *b.c.* 2.40.162; cf. Caes. *BCiu.* 1.30.2; 4–5; Dio 41.41.1 (neither mentioning Pollio). In Africa: App. *b.c.* 2.45.185–8; in Caes. *BCiu.* 2.43.1–4 these efforts are ascribed to the quaestor Marcius Rufus.

[7] Plut. *Ant.* 9.1–4 with Sumner, *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 260–1.

[8] Africa: Cic. *Att.* 12.2.1; Plut. *Caes.* 52.7–8. Spain: Cic. *Att.* 12.38.2 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc. Praetorship: Vell. 2.73.2 (*praeturius* in 44); Sumner, *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 358; for the possibility that Pollio was given praetorian status without holding the office see André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 17; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio* (1967), 34.

[9] See Gabba in *Legio VII Gemina* (Leon, 1970), 153–4; B. Lowe in A. Powell and K. Welch (eds.), *Sextus Pompeius* (London, 2002), 69–70, 79 86; A. Caballos Rufino, *El nuevo bronce de Osuna y la política colonizadora romana* (Seville, 2006), 321–4 (campaigns); 338–46 with *lex col. Gen.* XV (ibid. 133) (foundation of colony at Urso). The principal accounts are Vell. 2.73.2 (exaggerating Pollio's successes); App. *b.c.* 4.84.352 (also favourable); Dio 45.10.3–6 (hostile).

Octavian at Forum Gallorum (14 April 43) and Mutina (21 April). Pollio found himself largely marginalized and (he claimed) out of contact, but that enabled him to avoid premature commitment. His three letters to Cicero in spring/early summer 43 (*fam.* 10.31 (16 March (?)); 10.33 (shortly before 10.32); 10.32 (8 June)) must be read, not as the expression of Pollio's deepest political convictions (and commitment to republican ideals), but as carefully contrived mechanisms by which to safeguard his own interests, particularly after news of his friend Antony's defeat and withdrawal across the Alps.[10] If any clear political preference emerges, it is for an accommodation that would be anathema to Cicero, and Pollio's subsequent actions evince no devotion to the cause of *libertas* as either Cicero or Caesar's assassins understood it, despite his protestations of unreserved opposition to a renewal of the autocratic power enjoyed by Caesar (*fam.* 10.31.3).

What the letters also betray is a sense of Pollio's *dignitas* and belief in his own capacity to broker peace.[11] Subsequent developments, in particular the growing rapprochement between Octavian and Antony, allowed him to satisfy both. In late summer or autumn of 43 Pollio joined Antony, persuading Plancus to do likewise according to Appian.[12] In the proscriptions that followed the formation of the Triumvirate Pollio's father-in-law, L. Quinctius, appeared in fourth place on the list (App. *b.c.* 4.12.46; cf. 4.27.114), but Pollio prospered, designated for the consulship of 40 (when he would be about 35). Antony's trust was further demonstrated by his allocation to a command in Cisalpine Gaul, perhaps alongside Ventidius and with the responsibility of assisting Lepidus in ensuring control of Italy during the campaign of Philippi, though both his status and the exact date of his appointment are uncertain.

Pollio was certainly in Cisalpine Gaul, with seven legions (Vell. 2.76.2), in 41, despite the supposed agreement after Philippi that the province should be 'free'; but when war broke out between Octavian and L. Antonius, culminating in the siege of Perusia, he and the other Antonian commanders in Italy, uncertain of Antony's wishes and at odds amongst themselves, failed to take decisive action in support of Antony's brother.[13] Ultimately Perusia was left to its fate, and after its fall Pollio attempted to hold the position in eastern Cisalpine Gaul (Vell. 2.76.2). Velleius and Appian also report that he now won over the republican admiral Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus to Antony's cause and both succeeded in joining Antony at Brundisium.[14] In the peace negotiations that followed, Appian (*b.c.* 5.64.272) recounts that Pollio (now consul) was selected to represent Antony's interests. Reconciliation between Antony and Octavian must also have resulted in friendship between Pollio and

[10] Cf. Aulard, *De Asinii Pollionis Vita et Scriptis* (1877), 17–24; Bosworth, *Historia* 21 (1972), 452–462; M. Gelzer, *Chiron* 2 (1972), 297–312; G. O. Hutchinson, *Cicero's Correspondence* (Oxford, 1998), 107–11; Ferriès, *Partisans d'Antoine* (2007), 130–2, 337.

[11] For the latter see esp. Cic. *fam.* 10.33.1–2 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc.

[12] App. *b.c.* 3.97.399; cf. Livy *per.* 120; Vell.Pat. 2.63.3. Plut. *Ant.* 18.7 and Dio 46.53.2 say nothing of Pollio's role.

[13] See App. *b.c.* 5.31–3.121–33; 35.139–41.

[14] Vell. 2.76.2–3; App. *b.c.* 5.50.212. Other sources (Tac. *ann.* 4.44.2; Dio 48.16.2) again ignore Pollio's role; Suet. *Nero* 3.1 emphasizes Domitius' own initiative. On the crucial importance to Antony of Pollio's actions cf. Ferriès, *Partisans d'Antoine* (2007), 199–200, 338.

Octavian,[15] irrespective of whether his subsequent campaign against the Parthini in the hinterland of Dyrrhachium was conducted solely as governor of the strategically important province of Macedonia (and hence in Antony's portion of the empire) or, less probably, by virtue of a more loosely defined command which enabled him also to operate in Illyricum, and hence in Octavian's sphere.[16] The defeat of the Parthini itself was probably credited to Antony;[17] it was hardly a major military achievement but it brought Pollio a triumph,[18] the crowning glory of a spectacular career, particularly for a 'new man'.

If Pollio was offered further positions by Antony or Octavian, he declined them, anxious perhaps not to ally himself irrevocably with either dynast and content with the honours already secured. That requires no special explanation, especially given Pollio's oratorical ambitions, largely curtailed by more than ten years of almost continuous warfare. Distinction in the arts of peace was to match the *gloria* achieved in war (enabling Pollio to eclipse the renown of his *bête noire*, Cicero). Apart from his own literary endeavours, especially in tragedy (below), Pollio's friendship with, and patronage of, men with literary interests perhaps exceeded anything previously encountered at Rome; he also rebuilt the Hall of Liberty (Atrium Libertatis), equipping it with the first public library in the city.[19] The symbolism of Libertas was open to a variety of interpretations,[20] but since the work was at least partly financed from the defeat of a people accused of supplying forces to Brutus at Philippi,[21] it hardly comments on the loss of republican freedom or (in modernizing fashion) claims literature as the new last haven of liberty;[22] if it conveys any political message, it may, through its role as a centre of censorial activity, allude to the proper functioning of Rome's political institutions[23] or express expectations of a return to 'normal' political conditions once the Second Triumvirate had completed its self-appointed task. In fact the library, as well as making the Greek and Latin literary inheritance

[15] The Fescennine verses in which Octavian attacked Pollio and to which Pollio responded with a barbed allusion to Octavian's role in the proscriptions (Macr. 2.4.21) must belong to the propaganda of the Perusine War: cf. B. Zucchelli, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 326–30. Velleius' anxious apologetics (2.86.3) suggest that Pollio remained an *amicus* of Antony at least into the mid-30s.

[16] For bibliography see P. M. Nigdélis, *BCH* 118.1 (1994), 221–4; Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 129 n. 36; add M. Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum* (Ljubljana, 2005), 363–4, 369–74; Ph. Thibodeau, *CQ* 56 (2006), 618–23.

[17] App. *b.c.* 5.75.320 (cf. 4.88.373) must refer to Pollio's campaign, despite the apparent misdating (cf. also P. M. Nigdélis, *BCH* 118.1 (1994), 224–5). Whether Antony took an imperatorial salutation for Pollio's victories is most uncertain (despite Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 194); cf. M. Amandry, *SNR* 65 (1986), 74–5; *SNR* 69 (1990), 80–3.

[18] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.86 and 342 with commentary. The conventional dating of the triumph to 25 October 39 rather than 38 is highly disputable, whether or not Virg. *ecl.* 8.6–10 refers to Pollio (see n. 37).

[19] Atrium Libertatis: Suet. *Aug.* 29.5; Isid. *orig.* 6.5.2; N. Purcell, *PBSR* 61 (1993), 125–55; F. Coarelli, *LTUR* 1. 133–5; P. L. Tucci, *JRA* 18 (2005), 9 (with further bibliography). Library: Pliny *nat.* 7.115; 35.9–10; Isid. l.c.; cf. Ovid *trist.* 3.1.71–2; J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy* (Cambridge, 2006), 252–3.

[20] Syme, *RR* 154–6; C. Wirszubski, *Libertas* (Cambridge, 1950), 100–6; Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 133–48.

[21] Pliny *nat.* 7.115; App. *b.c.* 4.88.373; 5.75.320; Isid. *orig.* 6.5.2.

[22] As Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 599; W. Wimmel, *RhM* 141 (1998), 354–61, esp. 356; Morgan, *JRS* 90 (2000), 66. Ferriès, *Partisans d'Antoine* (2007), 226–7, argues that Pollio's enterprise was Caesarian in character.

[23] F. Hinard in Th. Hantos (ed.), *Laurea internationalis. Festschrift für Jochen Bleicken zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 2003), 338–9 with n. 42.

'public property' (Pliny *nat.* 35.10, perhaps echoing a commemorative inscription), both contributed to the growing creation of an imperial capital that could match, if not outstrip, the greatest cities of the Greek East and implicitly represented the Latin literary inheritance as worthy to stand alongside the Greek.[24]

It was as an orator, however, that Pollio excelled, and for his oratory that he and his friend Messalla Corvinus (no. 61), another survivor of the civil wars, were chiefly remembered.[25] Forensic oratory could still bring honour, fame, and advancement, and facilitate the further extension of the social ties essential to the retention and enhancement of status. Pollio himself not only appeared in the courts at least into his mid-sixties, but pinned fond hopes on the future success of his grandson, M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus (pr. AD 19).[26]

In the construction of a family dynasty Pollio was conspicuously more successful than many of his peers.[27] Imperial favour clearly played a significant role here, particularly in the rapid and early promotion of his son C. Asinius Gallus (b. 41 BC), who was a Quindecimvir by 17 BC, became consul in 8 BC with an accelerated governorship of Asia to follow (6/5), and married Vipsania, not only the daughter of Caecilia Attica and Agrippa but the former wife of Tiberius and mother of Drusus Caesar.

This alone suffices to dispel the image of Pollio as a disillusioned republican at odds with the new regime and hostile to the emperor.[28] His refusal to take part in the Actium campaign against Antony, supposedly pleading the ties of friendship and obligation, carried no direct criticism of the war itself, as its approving rehearsal by Velleius implies.[29] Under the new principate Pollio continued to cultivate a reputation for independence of action and frankness of speech, and retained his capacity and readiness to be free with his criticisms and engage in polemics, particularly perhaps where his own reputation and actions were in question.[30] Nonetheless, though he never actively proposed honours for Augustus and his reported responses to the emperor sometimes contain a pointed edge, he remained an *amicus* of the princeps, with whom he probably shared a similar austerity of moral outlook and certainly

[24] N. Purcell, *PBSR* 61 (1993), 145.

[25] Aulard, *De Asinii Pollionis Vita et Scriptis* (1877), 40–1; J. Osgood, *AJP* 127 (2006), 530–2, 544–6. For Pollio's known cases see André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 68–73.

[26] Sen. *contr.* 4 pr. 3–4 with J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge, 1981), 330 n. 31.

[27] See J. H. Oliver, *AJPh* 68 (1947), 147–60; Syme, *Tacitus*, 302; cf. also G. Alföldy, *Studi sull'epigrafia augustea e tiberiana di Roma* (Rome, 1992), 125–43.

[28] Bosworth, *Historia* 21 (1972), 451–2. For romantic portrayals of Pollio as (at least in spirit) a committed devotee of the old republican order see esp. Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 590–600; Syme, *RR* 4–6. Still more preconceived is Zecchini's depiction of him as the self-appointed guardian of the Caesarian faith (Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.30.2 (1982), 1278–9; id., *Cesare e il mos maiorum* (Stuttgart, 2001), 105–16; cf. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 132). For more realistic accounts see (besides Bosworth) Aulard, *De Asinii Pollionis Vita et Scriptis* (1877); B. Zucchelli, *Vichiana* 12 (1983), 326–36; cf. also Duret, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1512; Hose, *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit* (1994), 259–61.

[29] Vell. 2.86.3. Nor should Pollio be excluded from consideration for a possible grant of property in Egypt by Augustus (as L. Capponi, *ZPE* 140 (2002), 181–4, on P.Vindob. G 39919 and P.Coll. Youtie 1.19.12); cf. Tac. *ann.* 11.7.2.

[30] Independence of action: Sen. *dial.* 5.23.4–8 (harbouring of Timagenes). Frankness of speech: Tac. *ann.* 1.12.4 (with Goodyear ad loc.); Dio 57.2.5. Apart from literary polemics (and high sensitivity to supposed slights on his oratory: Sen. *suas.* 6.27) Pollio prepared invectives against L. Munatius Plancus (Pliny *nat.* praef. 31) and clashed with T. Labienus (Quint. *inst.* 1.5.8 with Shackleton Bailey on Cic. *fam.* 10.31.2).

similar preferences in terms of prose style, if not of art.[31] He offered him conventional forensic courtesies (assuming that 'Caesar' in Quint. *inst.* 9.4.132 is Augustus) and did little to justify his classification even as a passive critic of the new regime, which in any case should not be construed as ready to stamp on, or resent, any and every free expression of opinion.[32] Pollio continued to attend the senate: indeed Horace flatteringly implies that the senate looked to him for advice,[33] raising the possibility that he played some part in shaping the role that the senate was to play in the new dispensation; and he witnessed the drafting of a senatorial decree concerning arrangements for the *ludi saeculares* of 17 BC,[34] which his son, as Quindecimvir, helped to organize. Clearly Pollio adjusted to the new realities with aplomb, whilst preserving a reputation for independence of thought and speech through to his death in AD 4/5.[35] That image was no doubt carried over into his *History*, but his career offers scant basis for reconstructing the specific interpretation he will have placed on the events or personalities he depicted.

Works

History (Latin)

Pollio's literary output was extensive. In verse, alongside lighter poetry,[36] he was already lauded by Horace and (probably) Virgil for his tragedies in the early-to-mid 30s.[37] In prose some at least of his speeches were preserved for posterity, as were letters to Caesar and Plancus and perhaps a critique of Catullus and observations on specific passages in Virgil's *Aeneid*,[38] and he apparently also turned his hand to

[31] Responses to Augustus: Vell. 2.86.3; Sen. *dial.* 5.23.8. Friendship: see esp. Sen. *contr.* 4 pr.5; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio* (1967), 81; Bosworth, *Historia* 21 (1972), 445–6; the verbal sparring in Sen. *dial.* 5.23.8 may suggest how the relationship worked (Jos. *AJ* 15.342–3 would also be relevant here if it refers to our Pollio: cf. F's comm.). Views on morals and style: Syme, *RR* 484–5; id., *Sallust*, 288; Haller l.c. Art: P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1988), 70; J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy* (Cambridge, 2006), 252–3.

[32] Cf. already Aulard, *De Asinii Pollionis Vita et Scriptis* (1877), 32–6.

[33] *Carm.* 2.1.13–4 (T1) with Nisbet–Hubbard ad loc.

[34] *AE* 2002 n. 192, with T. Mommsen, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 8 (1891), 240 (against: L. Moretti, *RPAA* 55–6 (1982–4), 368); cf. also *IGRR* 4.33 (Sherk no. 26) col. b 40–1 (25 BC); Suet. *Aug.* 43.2.

[35] Hieron. *chron.* 170 (AD 4) with Sumner, *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 261.

[36] Pliny *epist.* 5.3.5. On the 'new poetry' ascribed to Pollio in Virg. *ecl.* 3.86 see Courtney, *FLP* 255; A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford, 2007), 217.

[37] Hor. *sat.* 1.10.42–3; Virg. *ecl.* 8.10 (on the issue of the addressee see Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* 2. 17–18; W. V. Clausen, *A Commentary on Virgil. Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994), 233–7; Ph. Thibodeau, *CQ* 56 (2006), 618–23); cf. Hor. *carm.* 2.1.9–12 (T1); Tac. *dial.* 21.7. On the possibility that he wrote in Greek as well as in Latin (Serv. *ecl.* 8.10) cf. J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979), 216. On the potential contribution of tragedy to Pollio's conception of history cf. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 112, 121–2, 132–3, 139.

[38] Speeches: *ORF*[4] no. 174. Letters to Caesar: Charis. 170; to Plancus (with criticism of Sallust): Gell. 10.26.1. Catullus: Charis. 124 with G. Funaioli, *Bollettino di Filologia Classica* 33 (1926), 36–7. Virgil: cf. (with reservations) A. Grisart, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 447–88 on Serv. *Aen.* 2.7; 6.554; 11.183. Pollio's comments on questions of linguistic propriety (e.g. André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 85–7; cf. Labienus 62 F2 with comm.) may derive from such works; cf. also Funaioli, *GRF* 498–9. His critique of Sallust (Suet. *gramm.* 10.2) may have been a separate work: cf. Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 322; note also M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *RFIC* 36 (1908), 267–8.

philosophy.[39] He probably did not actively embark on his *History* until the death of Sallust in 35 or 34 BC left his *Histories* incomplete.[40] His patronage of Ateius, who had previously assisted Sallust but who was now encouraged to write a work on historical style, supports this hypothesis.[41] The first evidence for the composition of the *History* is Horace *carm.* 2.1 (T1). Repeated attempts have been made to chart Pollio's progress by dating the ode, often in the 30s, but the probable echoes of Virgil, *Georgics* 1.474–5, 491–2, 497 in lines 29–32[42] point to 29 BC as a *terminus post quem* for its composition; and if it was to be read as set in a context earlier than 23 BC (the publication date of *carm.* 1–3), that context is now beyond recovery,[43] particularly since the ode plays an integral role both in book 2 and in books 1–3 as a whole.[44]

Horace's reference to a work full of the perilous luck of the roll of the dice (*periculosae plenum opus aleae* (line 6)) must allude to Caesar's words at the Rubicon as recorded by Pollio.[45] Thus his narrative had reached the outbreak of war by 23 BC and that matches possible allusions in Virgil's *Aeneid* to his account of Caesar's campaigns in Gaul and of the death of Pompey.[46] However, when Horace reaches the actual events of the civil war in 17 ff. there is an increasing slippage from a (possibly imaginary) re-creation of Pollio's narrative to the poet's own reliving of the past which takes him into conceptions that lie outside history's frame of reference and into material and perceptions whose specific contact with Pollio becomes increasingly problematic.[47] 'I seem to hear of' (line 21) arguably anticipates that part of Pollio's *History* yet to be completed,[48] and even lines 17–20 need contain no specific allusion to Pollio's account of Pharsalus: the motifs employed are familiar *topoi* that may as

[39] Sen. *epist.* 100.9 with D. G. Gambet, *TAPhA* 101 (1970), 173 n. 11. However, the supposed work *De consiliis* (E. Hauler, *Wiener Eranos* (Vienna, 1909), 221) should be expunged from Pollio's bibliography: see Cicero 39 T13 with *apparatus criticus* and I. 376 n. 35.

[40] Horace's specific reference to Jugurtha in *carm.* 2.1.28 (T1) implicitly represents Pollio as Sallust's successor both in subject matter and in the tradition of Roman historiography: so (e.g.) Peter 2. lxxxvi; Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 142 (seeing also the reference to Cato in 23–4 as an implicit allusion to the *Catiline*).

[41] Peter 2. lxxxvi; Ateius: Suet. *gramm.* 10.6 (T4) with Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 316–23.

[42] Cf. Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* ad loc.; Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 200–1.

[43] See esp. Lyne, *Horace* (1995), 93 n. 102; cf. Syme, *RP* 1. 424–5; Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 126–7.

[44] See esp. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 153–9; also Syme, *AA* 384–5; Lyne, *Horace* (1995), 92–3; Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (1997), 138–9, 164–5, 168–71, 177–80.

[45] O. Seeck, *WS* 24 (1902), 501–3; I 440.

[46] Gaul: commentary on F2. Pompey: J. L. Moles, *CW* 76 (1983), 287–8. On the possible implications of F5 for dating Pollio's account of Caesar's Egyptian campaign see comm. ad loc.

[47] See esp. H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz* 1 (3rd edn., Darmstadt, 2001), 340–2. On the shifting and ambivalent focalization apparent from the fifth strophe see also Lyne, *Horace* (1995), 91–4; Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (1998), 138; Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (1997), 182–5.

[48] P. Grimal in M. von Albrecht, W. Schubert (eds.), *Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift V. Pöschl* (Frankfurt, 1990), 167–8; Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 202–3. However, Gabba's supposition (*Appiano*, 243) that for the period after Caesar's assassination Pollio used Augustus' autobiography and was therefore writing no earlier than 22 BC (cf. C. B. R. Pelling in C. Smith and A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (Swansea, 2009), 53 ('after 25 or so')) depends on the assumption that the autobiography was not published in instalments (as suggested by J. W. Rich, ibid. 160–1) and that Appian (and Plutarch) drew directly on Pollio (cf. esp. Augustus 60 F7); on this see below; cf. also I. 470 on Peter's similar dating of Messalla's work.

well be owed to Horace's imagination.[49] Thus these later stanzas provide no sure guide to either the content or the date of Pollio's work.

Some, perhaps all, of the *History* may therefore have been composed in the early part of Augustus' principate when the first outlines of the new dispensation took shape, a process Pollio's *History* itself might have influenced through the interpretation it placed on the recent past and the preoccupations it embodied: Horace perhaps implicitly compares his imposition of order on the public events of the past with the role of the active statesman (and above all the princeps).[50] In turn, Pollio's own conception of the subject matter and scope of his work may have been progressively modified in response to changing circumstances, both literary and political. In particular he should be regarded not as a predecessor but as a contemporary of Livy, whose first pentad was published no later than 25 BC and was perhaps begun as early as the late 30s,[51] and his language and style may have betrayed the influence of other early Augustan writers.

Horace's specification of 'a civil conflict beginning from Metellus' consulship' is initially opaque, but Horace himself progressively discloses the reference with his introduction of 'ruinous friendships of leading men' (3–4), of the (ambiguous) notion of 'weapons smeared with blood as yet unexpiated' (4–5), and allusion to the Rubicon. Pollio clearly identified the pact of Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar of 60/59 (the so-called First Triumvirate) as the origins of the civil war of 49 BC, a conception already found in Cicero and attributed in Plutarch to Cato.[52] Horace's 'beginning from Metellus' consulship' alludes also to the role of Q. Metellus Celer (cos. 60 BC) in encouraging the pact with Caesar by obstructing Pompey and opposing the revision of the Asian tax contract that had been vigorously supported by Crassus:[53] responsibility for what followed did not lie solely with the dynasts. At the same time, Caesar's dictum at Pharsalus (F3) probably refers to a supposed threat of prosecution for his

[49] Supposed echoes of Pollio: Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22, (1896), 645–6; André, *La Vie et l'œuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 45; Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 201. *Topoi*: Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* ad loc. In the account of the battle in Plut. *Caes.* 45.2–5; *Pomp.* 71.7–8 (cf. 69.3–5); App. *b.c.* 2.76.318; 78.328 it was the specific technique of thrusting straight at their faces that panicked Pompey's cavalry. Horace's 'blaze of arms', though hardly complimentary to those it could put to flight (cf. e.g. Tac. *Agr.* 32.3 with R. M. Ogilvie, I. A. Richmond, *Tacitus Agricola* (Oxford, 1967), ad loc.), is at best a heavily veiled allusion to this (and would more appropriately describe Pompey's horsemen themselves on the basis of Plut. *Pomp.* 69.3).

[50] See Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* 2. 17; Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes* (1997), 182 n. 69; Morgan, *JRS* 90 (2000), 65; *contra*: Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 209 n. 78.

[51] Cf. P. J. Burton, *Historia* 49 (2000), 428–38 for a survey of recent scholarship (add Oakley, *Comm.* 1. 109–10; see also 1. 427).

[52] Cicero: Cic. *fam.* 6.6.4; *Att.* 7.3.4; 7.6; cf. *Phil.* 2.24; Caelius *ap.* Cic. *fam.* 8.14.2; Cestius *ap.* Sen. *suas.* 7.2. Cato: Plut. *Caes.* 13.5–6; *Pomp.* 47.4 (cf. *Pomp.* 48.6; 60.8; *Cat. Min.* 31.7; 33.5; 43.9; for Cato's supposed prescience see also e.g. Cic. *Att.* 12.4.2); here, as in Cic. *fam.* 6.6.4, the pact first destroys the power of its senatorial opponents before issuing in internal conflict; Horace's 'ruinous friendships' may reflect a similar conception in Pollio (cf. Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico*, 2.1. 404–6), though Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt*, 66 n. 11, argues plausibly that Munatius Rufus is the ultimate source for Plutarch's account of Cato's foresight (cf. also ibid. 29 on the potential epic associations of Horace's opening definition of Pollio's theme).

[53] Strongly emphasized in Dio 37.49.3–50.5 (hence ultimately from Pollio?); cf. Cic. *Att.* 1.18.5; 19.4; 20.5; 2.1.4 and 8; see also ibid. 1.17.9. Attempts to identify Metellus as the consul of 69 or 68 (L. Havas, *ACD* 16 (1980), 25–6) or see a reference to Q. Metellus Numidicus (cos. 109) (Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 203–12; *contra*: C. B. R. Pelling in B. McGing, J. Mossman (eds.), *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea, 2006), 271–2 n. 31) are without foundation.

actions in 59 (cf. comm. ad loc.), thus linking a professed immediate cause of Caesar's initiation of civil war in 49 back to the events of 60/59.

The use of such formulae elsewhere suggests that 'from Metellus' consulship' also identifies the starting-point of Pollio's *History*.[54] Some have supposed that he prefaced the main narrative with an extensive summary of earlier political history (on the model of Thuc. 1.89–117),[55] but that depends on a speculative and implausible identification of Pollio as the source of Appian, *Civil Wars* book 1 and an unnecessary inference from F1 (see comm. ad loc.): if there is a parallel with Thucydides' account of the Pentakontaetia, it more probably lies in Pollio's decision to begin his narrative of the civil war with political developments from 60 onwards.[56] More interesting is the relationship to Sallust's *Histories*, which ended abruptly in 67 BC. Even if, like the Sicilian historian Athanis in a similar situation (Diod. 15.94.4=*FGrHist* 562 T2), Pollio provided a retrospective résumé of the mid- and late 60s to bridge the gap, it is significant that he did not start with Pompey's ambition and the extraordinary commands he secured in 67 and 66 as the origin of the political rivalries and conflicts to come.

Horace implies that, so far as he knew it, Pollio's *History* focused strongly on the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, and the *Suda*'s confused entry under Asinius Pollio of Tralles (T6b) may allude to it as a work on that war (see I. 445). However, that does not entail that Pollio gave a merely summary narrative of events down to 49, as is sometimes inferred from F1 (see comm. ad loc.): he probably gave a sufficiently leisurely account of Caesar's campaigns in Gaul to include a digression on the Rhine (F2). Nor does it imply that Pollio originally intended to conclude his *History* with Caesar's victory or exclude the possibility that he extended the scope of his work as it progressed: the *Suda*'s figure of seventeen books (T6a), if correct, may indicate an expansion of the original scheme as well as indifference to formal book grouping.

The extant fragments go only to 43, although T5 may imply that Pollio included obituary notices for Brutus and Cassius and thus narrated the battle of Philippi.[57]

[54] Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* ad loc.; H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz* 1 (3rd edn., Darmstadt, 2001), 338 (suggesting an echo of Pollio's title); cf. Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 206.

[55] So E. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften* (Halle, 1924), 1. 382; Gabba, *Appiano*, esp. 83–8; Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 207–12; cf. Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 661–2. Against: e.g. E. Badian *CR* 8 (1958), 161; P. J. Cuff, *Historia* 16 (1967), 177–88; I. Hahn in G. Wirth (ed.), *Romanitas-Christianitas. Festschr. J. Straub* (Berlin, 1982), 251–60 (but see Hose, *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit* (1994), 175 n. 9).

[56] As well as some obvious differences, there were potential significant parallels with Thucydides' account of the background to the Peloponnesian War that Pollio could have exploited: former allies against a common enemy progressively fell prey to tensions and rivalry (1.18.3) resulting from the growing power and resources of the initially weaker partner (1.89–118, esp. 97.2; 118.2). Fear of that power, which, it was claimed, threatened its enemies with tyranny (1.122.3; cf. 124.3), was the real motive behind the Spartan decision to go to war (1.23.6; 33.3; 86.5; 88; 118.2) in response to pressure from allies continually critical of Spartan hesitation and delay (1.68–71) against an enemy marked by speed of decision and action and by resolute determination in the pursuit of ever more ambitious goals (1.70.1–9), a criticism echoed in the army's frustration with its commander's initially dilatory conduct of the war (2.18.3–5). How far Pollio pursued these parallels or they influenced his thinking it is, of course, impossible to say, but parallels with fifth-century Greek history, in this case focusing especially on Themistocles, had been much in the mind of one contemporary (Cic. *Att.* 7.11.3 (cf. App. *b.c.* 2.37.147); 8.2.4; 8.3.6; 9.10.3; 10.8.4; 10.8.7 (quoting Thucydides)).

[57] See in particular André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 47–8; Häussler, *RhM* 109 (1966), 342.

Whether Pollio went further, e.g. to Actium or even later, we cannot tell, although a continuation at least to 36 would have enabled him to include his own military successes in northern Greece.[58] There is no material in the surviving sources for that period which requires an origin in Pollio,[59] but the absence of securely datable fragments does not preclude it. Nor does Appian's allusive reference to Pollio's Parthinian campaign in *b.c.* 5.75.320 or his failure to include it in his (highly selective) *Illyrica*.[60] If we could be confident that F11 came from the *History* and referred to 38 BC or later, it would settle the issue, but neither assumption is secure.

Whatever the scope of the work, seventeen books implies a narrative broadly comparable in scale with those of Sallust or Livy.[61] The inclusion of digressive material (F1; F2) suggests that Pollio did not restrict himself to the theme of civil war, but offered a comprehensive account of the period in keeping with its function as a (semi-) continuation of Sallust's *Historiae*. The task was potentially enormous given the volume of material available,[62] but what sources Pollio employed we cannot now discern, other than Caesar's *Commentaries*, whose reliability he criticized (F8) in terms which imply that he possessed the first-hand knowledge or had conducted the enquiries necessary to correct Caesar's narrative. How far he did so, except where he could draw on personal knowledge (as in F3–4), we do not know.[63]

Reconstruction of the principal characteristics of Pollio's account has often relied heavily on the evidence of Plutarch and Appian; their shared material—or (parts of) Appian's account, such as its frequently positive depiction of Antony (taken as a reflection of Pollio's independent spirit and a justification of his former allegiances)—

[58] For modern views on Pollio's terminal date see Gabba, *Appiano*, 242–3. For 42 see also Badian, *CR* 8 (1958), 161–2; L. Havas, *ACD* 16 (1980), 26; G. Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.30.2 (1982), 1285–6. For 31/30: F. Altheim, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* 2 (1953), 122–8; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio*, 99–105; Gabba, l.c.; id., *Appiani b.c. lib. V*, xxxvii–xl; Hose, *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit* (1994), 306–12; Woodman in Braund, Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture* (2003), 201–3. Mazzarino's supposition that Pollio may have ended with Caesar's death (*Pensiero storico* 2.1. 401) is clearly disproved by F7 (cf. Zecchini l.c.).

[59] Despite e.g. Gabba, *Appiano*, 189–209, 229–44; *Appiani b.c. lib. V*, xxxvii–xlii. The most promising is the claim that Pollio was instrumental in persuading Domitius Ahenobarbus to join Antony (Vell. 2.76.2; App. *b.c.* 5.50.212; see 1. 432), but that is insufficient in isolation. Even if earlier material shared by Appian and Plutarch derives from Pollio, there is too little in this period (and too much disagreement) to demonstrate use of Pollio (as Altheim, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* 2 (1953), 123–4; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio* (1967), 104–5; cf. Pelling, *Plutarch, Life of Antony*, 27–8).

[60] As E. Badian, *CR* 8 (1958), 161–2. Appian organizes this section of the *Illyrica* broadly by 'tribe' (9.25) with a particular focus on the progressive subjection of peoples much further north. In that context Pollio's relatively insignificant successes within the province of Macedonia (Syme, *RP* 1. 22–3; *The Provincial at Rome* (Exeter, 1999), 170–3; M. Š. Kos, *Appian and Illyricum* (Ljubljana, 2005), 369–72, 405–8) might constitute an unwelcome distraction. For *b.c.* 5.75.320 cf. the perfunctory allusion to Pollio's campaigns against Sex. Pompeius in *b.c.* 4.84.352.

[61] On suggestions that Pollio devoted a book to each year of his account in a Greek version see e.g. Häussler, *RhM* 109 (1966), 342–3.

[62] André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 42–3; cf. E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius* (3rd edn., Stuttgart, 1922), 615–22.

[63] For F2 see comm. ad loc. Some ascribe to him the accounts of Caesar's Gallic campaigns in Plutarch, *Caes.* 15.1–27.10 and Appian's *Celtica* (see esp. Pelling, *CB* 60 (1984), 88–9), but they only exemplify Pollio's specific criticisms of the *Commentaries* in one or two particulars and their source is conjectural. Others see Pollio in Dio's more radical account of those campaigns (see bibliography in G. Zecchini, *Cassio Dione e la guerra gallica di Cesare* (Milan, 1978), 16; also G. Vrind, *Mnemosyne* 56 (1928), 207–13; cf. I. McDougall, *Latomus* 50 (1991), 628; S. G. Chrissanthos, *JRS* 91 (2001), 66), but much of this may be owed to Dio himself (cf. Pelling, *CR* 32 (1982), 146–8).

has frequently been attributed to direct, or indeed indirect, use of Pollio.[64] This is a debatable procedure. Undoubtedly, material identifiable as (ultimately) from Pollio is more prevalent in Appian and Plutarch than other sources, notably Pollio's own role in or presence at specific episodes (cf. above on Pollio's career). A prime example is the account of Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon in Appian and Plutarch.[65] This episode is ignored in Caesar, but for Pollio, whose presence is explicitly noted by Plutarch (*Caes.* 32.7), it was clearly a significant piece of political theatre and attests his taste for vivid and dramatic narrative, although if the Plutarch–Appian account as a whole goes back to Pollio, it would demonstrate also his capacity for invention in the pursuit of literary and thematic effect, especially perhaps at critical junctures in the narrative.[66] However, neither Plutarch nor Appian self-evidently uses Pollio as his sole source, and the assumption that their shared material (nearly) always depends on a direct and usually independent use of Pollio is precarious. On the one hand, Appian may himself draw on Plutarch more extensively than is usually supposed;[67] on the other, if all their shared material derives from the same source, this may not be Pollio himself but an intermediary.[68] In that event, of course, we have no means of controlling the different sources employed by the intermediary or the extent to which it imposed its own interpretation on the material.

Equally, we should not reconstruct the *History* (and identify its traces in secondary sources) on the basis of inferences from Pollio's career and letters about his attitudes to the events and personalities recounted. Our starting-point must rather be the surviving fragments and testimonia. Kornemann conjectured, primarily on the basis of a comparison of Horace *carm.* 2.1.1–8 with Tacitus *Histories* 1.1–3, that the opening two stanzas of the ode reflect programmatic motifs in Pollio (presumably in his preface), starting with his definition of his subject.[69] If so, Pollio proclaimed his history as more than the mere recital of facts: it probed causes and explained the way

[64] See in particular Groebe, *RE* 2. 1506; Schwartz, *RE* 2. 226–33; Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), esp. 560–79; Gabba, *Appiano*, esp. 229–49; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio* (1967), 106–12; Pelling *CB* 60 (1984), 88–9; id., *Plutarch. Life of Antony*, 27–8; id., *Plutarch and History*, esp. 12–13; id., in H. Heftner, K. Tomaschitz (eds.), *Ad Fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004* (Vienna, 2004), 317–27; id., *Plutarch, Caesar*, 40, 45–7; C. Carsana, *Commento storico al libro II delle Guerre Civili di Appiano (parte I)* (Pisa, 2007), 22–3. Further bibliography in K.Matijević, *Marcus Antonius Consul-Proconsul-Staatsfeind* (Rahden, 2006), 18 with n. 14.

[65] Plut. *Caes.* 32.4–8; *Pomp.* 60.4; cf. App. *b.c.* 2.35.137–40. Cf. also above on Hor. *carm.* 2.1.6 (T1). Suet. *Iul.* 31.1–32 probably draws on some of the same material but differs in significant details and adds further elaboration from a different source (P. Bicknell, D. Nielsen, *SLLRH* 9 (1998), 148–9; Wiseman, *Roman Drama*, 61; cf. also *Iul.* 81.2, with Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 343–4).

[66] Cf. Aulard, *De Asinii Pollionis Vita et Scriptis* (1877), 8; Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 621; O. Seeck, *WS* 24 (1902), 501–2; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio* (1967), 142; E. Badian, *Gnomon* 62 (1990), 29–30; P. Bicknell, D. Nielsen, *SLLRH* 9 (1998), 138–66 (increasingly conjectural); Canfora, *Giulio Cesare* (1999), 160–1. So, in particular, Caesar's adaptation of the chilling prophecy of the Spartan herald Melesippus as Archidamus was about to invade Attica at the start of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.12.3 with Gomme ad loc; Kornemann, *Philologus* 63 (1904), 148–9). *If* this appeared in Pollio in the form given in Appian (*b.c.* 2.35.140; cf. 69.288), it would claim for Pollio's *History* a theme and significance parallel to, but even greater than, that of the greatest of Greek historians.

[67] Cf. e.g. I. 470–1.

[68] See e.g. Thouret, *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 333–8; Peter 2. lxxxviii–lxxxx; M. Kuber, *Die politischen Anfängen Octavians in der Darstellung des Velleius und dessen Verhältnis zur historiographischen Tradition* (Würzburg, 2000), esp. 416–24; cf. comm. on F4; I. 107, 393.

[69] Kornemann, *Klio* 3 (1903), 551; cf. Syme, *RR* 5 n. 1; Nisbet–Hubbard, *Comm.* 2. 8–9.

in which events unfolded. These, like the play of Fortune, were familiar *topoi* which Pollio may well have espoused and exemplified in his narrative.[70] That he stressed the dangers attendant on his enterprise is also probable – most notably the risk of offending not merely the (future) emperor but participants in these events (or their descendants), who might resent reminders of their past, protest at the way in which they were presented, or complain of their omission. Like Sallust and others before him Pollio may also have dealt with his own credentials as a historian of the period and have sought to vindicate his account from the charge of partisanship (perhaps contrasting his work with e.g. that of Tanusius (cf. I 392–4, introduction to Tanusius no. 44)); if his critique of the *Commentaries* of his benefactor Caesar (F8) appeared in the *History*, it perhaps served both this purpose and to demonstrate more generally the freedom of speech that Pollio cultivated and will have claimed for his work. How objective his account was we have no means of knowing (and the most diverse modern judgements have been offered[71]). If Tacitus (or Cremutius: T5) can be trusted, he was at least broadly positive in his treatment of Brutus and Cassius.[72] On the other side, the elder Seneca (F7) suggests that his account of Cicero in his narrative was unfavourable and his obituary of the orator is the most critical of those preserved.

Pollio's inclusion of such obituaries exemplifies also the larger focus on individual personalities that is implicit in Horace's emphasis on the 'ruinous friendships of leading men'. The phrase is pointedly paradoxical, and Horace's focus in *carm.* 2.1 on the paradox of civil war (and the problems it creates for the normal evaluation of military qualities and achievements) may reflect a preoccupation of Pollio. So also his emphasis on the element of chance in the outcome and the 'play of Fortune', particularly as it affected individuals (both are introduced in Cicero's obituary and no doubt featured in the account of Pompey's ignominious end); and at the wider level too Pollio perhaps depicted a community that was no longer in control of its own destiny. At the same time, if Horace's opening stanzas imply a grand overarching conception of his subject, they may also betray a schematism in Pollio's historical analysis that not only ignored the complexities of politics in the 50s but arguably attributed exaggerated significance to the pact between Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar and may even have antedated its creation. Indeed, Pollio may have initiated the process of implicit assimilation of the pact of 60/59 to the Triumvirate of 43 that appears in our surviving sources. Nor is it likely that Pollio escaped the moralizing approach to historiography: the obituary of Cicero not only exploits the familiar contrast between past and present but implicitly portrays a political society in which individual feuds take priority over the welfare of the *res publica*, not least presumably in the conflict between Cicero and Antony in 44–43 BC. It also judges Cicero by the

[70] See Nisbet–Hubbard ad loc., who detect further possible echoes of Pollio's preface in lines 25–8, 29, and 31.

[71] For Pollio as an 'unbiased' historian see e.g. Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 603; Hose, *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit* (1994), 263–4. For Pollio as writing partisan history see e.g. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 94; Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.30.2 (1982), 1284.

[72] And probably Cato, though it cannot be certain that Horace's ambivalent reference to Cato's unrelenting soul (*carm.* 2.1.24) exactly mirrors Pollio.

austere standards of 'traditional' Roman self-control that Pollio paraded in his own conduct.[73]

If Pollio's concern with civil war and 'ultimate causes' suggests the influence of Thucydides, what is known of the content of his *History* accords with Cicero's prescriptions, particularly in *de orat.* 2.62. Even Pollio's remarkable authorial interventions in his obituary of Cicero (F7) are in keeping with Cicero's suggestion to Lucceius (*fam.* 5.12.4, 6–7) that he use his authority to pass judgement on actions and individuals. Although they are probably specific to their context and not characteristic of his normal narrative mode, Pollio's focus in the obituary on Cicero's immoderate responses to both successes and setbacks reflects a well-established preoccupation in Greek and Roman historiography.[74] Whether his style would have met Cicero's expectations is another matter, although inferences from his letters or what is recorded of his severe, unadorned, and abrupt oratorical manner[75] that lack support in the surviving fragments may need modification and refinement. Even in declamation Pollio allowed himself greater licence than in oratory,[76] and in evidently encouraging Ateius to 'advise' him on historical style (T4) he clearly acknowledged the different requirements of history.

Ateius presumably anticipated that his own emphasis on clarity of expression through the use of established, unpretentious, and appropriate language[77] would accord with Pollio's own preferences. Nisbet and Hubbard (*Comm.* 2. 10–11 (cf. also 12, 15)) attractively suggest that the two opening stanzas of T1 reflect Pollio's own spare historical style, but also that the variations in the tone of the ode may reflect variations in Pollio's own narrative manner: indeed, Horace himself suggests that Pollio's prose had the vividness to set his imagination running, and that appears to be reflected in F3(a)–(b) and in other material (such as the crossing of the Rubicon) that probably goes back to Pollio.[78] Certainly Pollio's obituary of Cicero (F7) shows a careful attention to rhetorical effect in what was evidently a purple passage, though the particularity of the subject matter means that some of its more striking features (e.g. its use of Ciceronian rhythms and reminiscence) are unlikely to have characterized the work as a whole. Where it may be more typical is in its deployment of elevating expressions and recent linguistic innovations since these are recurrent features of historiographical prose (cf. also comm. on F11), and its concern with balance and antithesis mirrors a preoccupation of Pollio's surviving letters. Also to be found in the letters, and so perhaps more generally typical of Pollio, is the obituary's

[73] See esp. Sen. *contr.* 4 pr. 4–6; also Sen. *ben.* 4.31.3–4; cf. Pliny *epist.* 7.4.6 with M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *RFIC* 36 (1908), 274–5.

[74] Cf. J. Marincola, *SyllClass* 18 (2007), 39–40, 46–7. Pollio's judgement was endorsed by Livy so far as Cicero's reaction to misfortune was concerned (Sen. *suas.* 6.22).

[75] See esp. Leeman *Orationis Ratio*, 160–3, 187–90; Woodman, *Rhetoric*, 127–8. *ORF*[4] 516–18 conveniently sets out the evidence.

[76] Sen. *contr.* 4 pr.3; J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge, 1981), 285–6. On Pollio and declamation see E. Berti, *Scholasticorum Studia. Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale* (Pisa, 2007), 132–9.

[77] Cf. R. A. Kaster, *Suetonius, de grammaticis* (Oxford, 1995), ad loc. and Pollio's own criticism of Sallust's 'excessive' use of archaisms (Suet. *gramm.* 10.2); also the (at best) very limited citation of Pollio's *History* by the grammarians.

[78] Cf. C. B. R. Pelling in B. McGing, J. Mossman (eds.), *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea, 2006), 264–5.

sometimes banal repetition and positioning of pronouns and its striking word arrangement (cf. also Sen. *epist.* 100.7 on Pollio's oratory).[79] If Pollio's avoidance of elaborate sentence structure here was also typical of the work, it could easily have descended into monotony, but again the different narrative style encountered in Pollio's letters[80] counsels caution. Certainly, however, it must have been in his stylistic and literary accomplishment above all that the Patavinian Livy eclipsed the consular historian, who had purportedly himself borne down hard on that town's citizens in the late 40s (Macr. 1.11.22): despite his probable long-standing acquaintance with Pollio,[81] the elder Seneca (F7) appears less than impressed by the literary qualities of his *History* as a whole, perhaps ironically implying that ploughing through it will constitute some sort of amends (*poenas*: cf. *TLL* 10.1.16.2497.45–6; 2498.72 ff.; 2507.3 ff.) to Cicero for Pollio's malevolent portrait of the orator; and when primacy in Roman historiography is later under discussion, Pollio is conspicuous by his absence.[82]

Nonetheless, for later chroniclers of this period Pollio should have been high on their reading list, given his closeness to the events narrated, his personal involvement in a number of crucial episodes,[83] and his access to eyewitness accounts and other primary information. As a result, his narrative very probably exercised heavy influence on subsequent accounts: his view of the significance of the 'First Triumvirate', for example, certainly proved to be seminal.[84] Livy in particular will have familiarized himself with the *History* and perhaps wrote partly in reaction to it.[85] Valerius Maximus cites the *History* once (F1) and may well have drawn on it more extensively. That Velleius also used it has often been inferred from his highly flattering account of Pollio and hostile depiction of Pollio's *inimicus*, Munatius Plancus, of whom Pollio

[79] Cf. Schmalz, *Über den Sprachgebrauch* (1880), esp. 52–6; Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 666–7. There are no grounds for regarding these features as conscious imitations of Thucydides (as André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 108–9), and there is no positive evidence that Thucydides was a stylistic model in the *History* (as esp. Morgan, *JRS* 90 (2000), 61–3) any more than in Pollio's oratory (cf. Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 138–9; A. Cavarzere, *Oratoria a Roma* (Rome, 2000), 197–201): not refuted by Woodman, *Rhetoric*, 151 n. 49).

[80] G. O. Hutchinson, *Cicero's Correspondence* (Oxford, 1998), 109.

[81] M. T. Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 5–6.

[82] Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 145 n. 113; Morgan, *JRS* 90 (2000), 62. On Pollio's criticism of Livy's 'Patauinitas' (Quint. *inst.* 1.5.56; 8.1.3), see N. M. Horsfall, *SCI* 16 (1997), 71–4; more recently, but less persuasively, T. Adamik in R. Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif VIII* (Hildesheim, etc., 2008), 34–41; J. Muñiz Coello, *Klio* 91 (2009), 125–43.

[83] e.g. comm. on F4. However, the fact that we can most confidently ascribe to Pollio (a limited quantity of) material in our secondary sources that concerns Pollio himself, or where his presence is explicitly recorded, should not mislead us into supposing that this was necessarily a dominant characteristic of the *History* as a whole (as Morgan, *JRS* 90 (2000), esp. 56–7), although there was a well-established tradition in Roman historiography of including the author's own actions (T. J. Cornell in C. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus*, (Swansea, 2009), 15–40, esp. 16–17). Nor can we know whether he explicitly noted his status as an eyewitness beyond the normal historiographical contexts in which this might be emphasized (for which see Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 79–86).

[84] Livy *per.* 103; Vell. 2.44.1; Lucan 1.84–6; Florus 2.13.8–9; Dio 37.56.1–58.3; Syme, *RR* 8.

[85] His obituary of Cicero (Sen. *suas.* 6.22=Livy fr. 59 Jal) clearly responds to that of Pollio: cf. W. Richter in G. Radke (ed.), *Cicero, ein Mensch seiner Zeit* (Berlin, 1968), 181–2; A. J. Pomeroy, *The Appropriate Comment* (Frankfurt a.M., etc., 1991), 146–8.

presumably gave a critical portrayal in the *History*,[86] although it is possible that Velleius draws on other more directly apologetic material, such as Pollio's 'response to Antony's insults'.[87] Strabo certainly made some use of the *History* and has sometimes been regarded as a major intermediary between Pollio and later sources drawing on his material.[88] Others have cast the elder Seneca's *History* 'from the start of the civil wars' (no. 74) in a similar role, and Seneca must certainly have used it, as very probably did Lucan. Yet although Asconius had had some acquaintance with Pollio's son (Serv. *ecl.* 4.11(DS)), he never cites Pollio, and there is no substantial reason to suppose that he used him in drawing up his commentary. Of later Latin authors only the elder Pliny (T3) and Suetonius show certain evidence of consulting the *History* (in Suetonius' case perhaps in detail (cf. *Iul.* 55.4)[89]), although Tacitus probably exploited it in ways that can now only be conjectured[90] and Fronto may have used it in the so-called *Principia historiae*.[91] Its possible use by Plutarch and Appian has already been discussed; attempts to discern signs of direct consultation in Dio[92] are speculative.

A Greek *History*?

T6b has often been taken to attest a Greek translation (or reworking) of all or part of Pollio's *History* by one of his freedmen.[93] A Greek translation of Pollio is not impossible, given that Sallust's *Histories* were (exceptionally) so translated in the early second century,[94] but the *Suda*, which shows some interest in translations of

[86] See e.g. recently Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative* (Cambridge, 1983), 177, 186; M. Elefante, *Velleius Paterculus* (Hildesheim, 1997), 30–1, 390–1; cf. also M. Kober, *Die politischen Anfänge Octavians in der Darstellung Velleius und dessen Verhältnis zur historiographischen Tradition* (Würzburg, 2000), 386–7, 390–2, 423–4; A. Wright, *CPh* 97 (2002), 181–4; A. Pistellato, *RCCM* 48 (2006), 71–2.

[87] Charis. 100 (so the Neapolitanus; but a now lost MS cited by Cuyck had Laberius (*lege* Labienus?) as the author of the insults to which Pollio replied).

[88] So esp. Otto, *LSKPh* 11 Suppl. (1889), 245–84; cf. also F. Lasserre, *Strabon, Géographie* 2 (Paris, 1966), 7–9, 109–10. That Timagenes, who famously took refuge with Pollio (Sen. *dial.* 5.23.4–8), used his *History* is highly likely but explicit confirmation is lacking. For attempts to demonstrate that Nicolaus of Damascus used Pollio see Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 586–7; B. Scardigli, *Historia* 32 (1983), 121–3; K. Matijević, *Marcus Antonius Consul-Proconsul-Staatsfeind* (Rahden, 2006), 17 n. 12.

[89] However, Gascou's attempt (*Suétone historien*, esp. 130–2) to demonstrate substantial use of Pollio by Suetonius remains hypothetical. The passage in Pliny *nat.* 7 to which T3 refers cannot be identified (despite Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 401–2).

[90] Thus the speech of Pollio's son, Asinius Gallus, in Tac. *ann.* 2.32.2–3 (AD 16), opposing fresh restraints on *luxuria*, clearly resembles Q. Hortensius' speech of 55 BC to the same effect in Dio 39.37.3–4 (Syme, *Tacitus*, 1. 324; M. Coudry, *CCG* 15 (2004), 157, 161–2), and might be an (ironic) echo of the austere father's record of the earlier debate.

[91] Cf. Fronto 205 (apparently in the context of a disparaging account of empires and their ruling peoples prior to Rome). The identification of the Pollio scorned by Marcus Aurelius (Fronto 29) with the historian is, however, highly dubious (see van den Hout ad loc.).

[92] e.g. André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949), 64–5; G. Zecchini, *Aevum* 53 (1979), 85–7; further bibliography in K. Matijević, *Marcus Antonius Consul-Proconsul-Staatsfeind* (Rahden, 2006), 23 n. 25; cf. also above n. 63.

[93] So Peter 2. lxxxxii–lxxxxiii; cf. Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 578; André, *La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion*, 51–4; Gelzer, *Kl. Schr.* 2. 312; 3. 291–2; Haller, *C. Asinius Pollio*, 108; also more cautiously Jacoby, *FGrHist* 193 comm.

[94] *Suda* Z73 (2.506 Adler). Exceptional: J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979), 293–4.

Latin works, usually specifies them as such,[95] and its entry on 'Trallianus'[96] is clearly confused: if 'Trallianus' worked in the second half of the first century BC he cannot have written a work of recollections of the Neronian philosopher Musonius,[97] and it is highly unusual for a freedman to assume the *cognomen* of his patron. There is therefore a strong probability that, as elsewhere (cf. Cornutus 54 T1), information relating to more than one individual has been combined in the *Suda* entry and that the anomalous nomenclature results from a false identification of the principal subject, a 'sophist' called Pollio, with the historian.[98] In that case, the work on the Roman civil war fought by Caesar and Pompey may well be Pollio's own history in Latin, to which the *Suda* attached particular significance.[99] At all events, the *Suda* provides as poor support for a version in Greek as does F3b for a translation of the Latin *History* by Pollio himself (for which see comm. ad loc.).

The fragments are arranged in three categories: (i) one fragment explicitly attributed to book 3 of the *History*; (ii) fragments which are explicitly attributed to the *History* or can be so attributed with confidence, in probable chronological order of the events referred to; (iii) possible fragments of the *History* in chronological order of the citing sources.[100]

(AD)

[95] M. Schettino in G. Zecchini (ed.), *Il lessico Suda e la memoria del passato a Bisanzio* (Bari, 1999), 119.

[96] *Τραλλιανός* in the *Suda* is often taken as a *cognomen* (and is very occasionally attested as a proper name: *CIL* 6.27565; *AE* 1989, 341a), but presumably identifies his origin.

[97] Cf. esp. Peter, *NJPhP* 119 (1879), 421, also on further confusions of individuals named Pollio in the *Suda*. In T6a the *Suda* seems to ascribe to our Pollio the Greek history in Latin of Pompeius Trogus (see Jacoby l.c. with references; Häussler, *RhM* 109 (1966), 342–5).

[98] Thouret, *LSKPh* 1 (1878), 325–8; H. Flach, *RhM* 36 (1881), 317 with n. 1 (cf. ibid. 319); Häussler, *RhM* 109 (1966), 346; M. Schettino in G. Zecchini (ed.), *Il lessico Suda e la memoria del passato a Bisanzio* (Bari, 1999), 118.

[99] Schettino l.c.

[100] We have not included here attestations of Pollio's use of *turturellae* (*dub. nom. GL* 5.592=*ORF*^{4} 174 F22), *figulatus* (Quint. *inst.* 8.3.32=*ORF*^{4} 174 F33), *hos lodices* (Quint. *inst.* 1.6.42=*ORF*^{4} 174 F42), or *fimbriatus* (Quint. *inst.* 8.3.32=*ORF*^{4} 174 F44) which must derive from oratorical works given their linguistic character and, in the last three cases, Quintilian's preoccupation with forensic usage. We have included F12–13 only with considerable reservations.

57

C. Sulpicius Galba

Editions: Peter 2. lviii, 41; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 92; M. Horster, *BNJ* 92.

Principal discussions: H. Dessau, *PIR* 3 (1898), S 720; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 324; M. Fluss, 'C. Sulpicius (52) Galba', *RE* 4A (1931), 755–6; J. H. Oliver, 'C. Sulpicius Galba, Proconsul of Achaia', *AJA* 46 (1942), 380–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 260–1; C. Vatin, 'Décrets de Delphes d'époque romaine, 1: C. Sulpicius Galba', *BCH* 96 (1972), 253–8; M. Hose, 'C. Sulpicius Galba als griechischer Historiker: Zu FGrHist 92', *ZPE* 92 (1992) 151–2.

INTRODUCTION

Life

C. Sulpicius Galba (the *praenomen* is guaranteed by the *Fasti Lucerini*: Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1, 259), the grandfather of the emperor Galba, belonged to a distinguished patrician family, although its last republican consul (not a linear ascendant) held office in 108 BC. His father, Ser. Sulpicius Galba, was praetor in 54, fought for Caesar in the civil war, but later joined the conspiracy against him. Born around 68 BC, the historian himself did not advance beyond the praetorship, held presumably under the triumvirs, although he may have served as proconsul of Achaea under Augustus, between 27–23 or 13–10 BC (thus Oliver, *AJA* 46 (1942), 380–8, with the modifications of Vatin, *BCH* 96 (1972), 253–8). His son, C. Sulpicius Galba, was an orator and suffect consul in 5 BC, and father of the future emperor.

Work

The two surviving fragments refer respectively to the age of Romulus (F1) and to Pompey's campaign against Sertorius (F2), which may suggest that Galba's history was a traditional annalistic history from the origins to recent times. The only other clue to its character is Suetonius' description of it as *multiplex nec incuriosa* (T2). While the second part of this phrase must mean 'not neglectful' (Bardon's 'mal informée' presumably overlooks the double negative), i.e. 'diligent' or 'painstaking' (*TLL* 7.1.1082.39), the first word is more problematic. While *multiplex* can mean 'consisting of many parts', i.e. literally 'voluminous', it can also mean 'consisting of many distinct parts', i.e. 'variegated', 'multifarious', 'multifaceted', or simply 'wide-ranging' (*TLL* 8.1591). Our translation adopts the latter interpretation, but there can be no certainty about what Suetonius actually intended. Nevertheless his assessment of its qualities can be taken as generally positive.

Jacoby's notion that Galba's work was a universal history written in Greek has rightly won little support. It was based on a speculative and now discredited

restoration of a Delphic proxeny decree (*SEG* 1.169=*FGrHist* 92 T2), which in any case probably refers not to Galba the historian but to his son (cos. suff. 5 BC: thus Vatin, *BCH* 96 (1972), 257–8; in general Hose, *ZPE* 92 (1992), 151–2).

There is no reason to identify Galba with the author quoted by Nepos, *Hann.* 1 (=Sulpicius Blitho 55 F1), as proposed by G. F. Unger (*Der sogenannte Cornelius Nepos*, *ABAW* 16.1 (1882), 154); cf. Peter 1^2, cccl xxix.

(CJS)

58

L. Arruntius

Editions: Peter 2. lviii–lviiii, 41–2.

Principal discussions: P. von Rohden, 'L. Arruntius (7)', *RE* 2 (1896), 1262; E. Groag, *PIR*^{2} A (1933), 1129; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 327–9; Syme, *RR* 227 n. 1, 282, 297; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 96–7; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 200, 382, 620 n.; Syme, *Sallust* (1964), 291–2; B. D. Hoyos, 'A forgotten Roman historian: L. Arruntius and the "true" causes of the First Punic War', *Antichthon* 23 (1989), 51–66; T. J. Cadoux, rev. B. Levick, *OCD*^{4} (2012), 169.

INTRODUCTION

Life

There might be two contenders for identification with the historian of the First Punic War whom the younger Seneca mocked in his *Letters* as an inept imitator of the archaism and brevity of Sallust's style (F1–7): the veteran of the civil wars who held the consulship in 22 BC, and his son, consul AD 6, the man who was, in the well-known anecdote, considered by Augustus to be both willing to take on the principate, and capable of it.[1] However, scholars agree (though Groag in *PIR*^{2} A, 1130 is hesitant) that the earlier L. Arruntius is the historian. The son would have been known personally to Seneca; he was a respected figure whose death early in 37 in face of the accession of Caligula[2] would have had resonances that would hardly have allowed Seneca to allude to him so flippantly. Von Rohden and Peter argue for the consul of 22 BC on the grounds that Seneca's *uir rarae frugalitatis* must be the same man as the figure whose integrity is alluded to by Velleius Paterculus (T1); not that the son did not also have a reputation for the highest integrity.[3] Again, Peter invokes the respectful manner in which Tacitus alludes to the younger Arruntius, as a famous orator of great experience; such a writer would be unlikely to have been guilty of the degree of ineptitude that Seneca reports.[4]

If the identity of the historian with the consul of 22 BC is accepted, it has implications for the relationship of his work to Livy's: he could have been writing at a time when Sallust's influence was at its height and before Livy's work had established its rival claims. L. Arruntius L. f. L. n., of the tribe Teretina, may have come from Atina in Latium, where he attended to the road system.[5] Having been proscribed in 43 BC,

[1] *PIR*^{2} A, 1130. Potential emperor: Tac. *ann.* 1.13.2.

[2] Tac. *ann.* 6.47–8.; Dio 58.27.4.

[3] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 96–7, on Vell. 2.86.2; Hoyos, *Antichthon* 23 (1989), 56–7, also accepts this identification. Integrity of the younger Arruntius: Tac. *ann.* 1.13.1; 6.7.1; 11.6.4, with R. S. Rogers, *CPh* 26 (1931), 29–45.

[4] Peter cites Schanz, *GRL* 2.1^2. 284 for this point. Orator: Tac. *ann.* 11.6.4.

[5] *ILS* 5349.

he fled to Sextus Pompeius in Sicily, but in 39 BC the concordat of Misenum allowed him and other notables to return to Rome. By the time of Actium in 31 he was with Octavian, and successfully commanded the left wing of the fleet.[6] He then became a prominent statesman of the Augustan senate, the first consul in his family. In 17 BC he was one of the *quindecimuiri sacris faciundis* who were in charge of celebrating the Secular Games.[7] This was a priesthood that in the view of R. Syme[8] often went to men of literary bent; Tacitus was a later holder. In court he could be a formidable opponent: his dealings with C. Albucius Silus in the Centumviral Court permanently put his opponent off forensic oratory.[9] The family forged links with the nobility and patriciate.[10]

Works

Arruntius' qualifications to write of the largely naval First Punic War (264–241 BC), which centred on Sicily (and was far enough in the past to be a 'safe' subject), are obvious from his Actian command, and Hoyos argues from this for a date later than 30 BC for the work; it is certainly later than Sallust's *Histories*, which were used by Arruntius (see comm. below). Actium will not have been Arruntius' first experience of sea warfare, however: as a follower of Sextus Pompeius, who dominated the seas round Sicily, he could have been at sea before. The theme, from Rome's glorious past and the beginning of her crushing of Carthage, was inevitably attractive to a patriotic Roman—and a contrast to the more recent civil war. Arruntius' work, which was probably entitled *Historiae belli Punici* (T2, F4), was in more than one book. The first included the exploits of Regulus (256 BC) (F7); the latest identifiable event is the fall of Panhormus (254 BC) (F3).

As Bardon notes, Arruntius, besides being the historian of the First Punic War (there is no positive sign that he went further), was also seen as a geographer, for he is cited in Pliny's bibliography of the 'geographical' books (T3) alongside Statius Sebosus, the geographer and paradoxographer.[11] That may not entail a separate geographical work: there was scope for geographical comment in his history.

Seneca does not criticize the archaism of Arruntius' style, the main burden of criticism of Sallust himself in Augustan times (though Arruntius' imitation itself shows that such disapproval was not universal), but perhaps it is worth pointing out that his remote subject might seem to justify it. Again, Arruntius, writing of naval war round Sicily, might well have been tempted to colour his account with striking language; most historians, from Cato onwards, looked for striking language, especially in major episodes. Nor was Arruntius the only writer to be attracted to the Sallustian style: Velleius Paterculus and later Tacitus are obvious examples. He might have been judged less harshly by writers who did not share Seneca's particular tastes; his own

[6] Plut. *Ant.* 66.3; App. *b.c.* 4.46.195–7; Vell. 2.77.2–3.; battle at 2.85.2.

[7] *ILS* 5050, line 151.

[8] Syme, *Tacitus*, 65 (members required 'scholarship and good sense' to interpret archives including the Sibylline Books).

[9] Sen. *contr.* 7. pr. 7; cf. Quint. 9.2.95; Suet. *rhet.* 6.

[10] Syme, *Tacitus*, 382.

[11] A. Klotz, *RE* 2A. 966–8, no. 3; W. Kroll, *RE* 3A (1929), 2223, no. 28. Dio 50.14.1.

style was subjected to severe criticism: Suet. *Cal.* 53.2, with the commentaries of D. Wardle (Brussels, 1994) and D. W. Hurley (Atlanta, Ga., 1993); Quint. *inst.* 10.1.125–31, with a note on Seneca's severe judgments on others at 126.

Arruntius' work is not mentioned after Pliny's time, however, and the care with which Seneca characterizes it suggests that it was already forgotten in his time. It seems, as Peter suggests, to have fallen victim to the authority of Livy; in Seneca there is no hint that the content made up for the style that he, whose own style was not free of idiosyncrasies, thought so bizarre. Nonetheless Hoyos, noticing the 'delayed effect' of Pompeius Trogus, argues that Arruntius shared Sallust's disillusionment with Roman morality before 146 and was the source of unfavourable accounts of Rome's motives for going to war in 264, as they appear in Florus 1.18. [2.2]; Dio fr. 43.1–4, with Zon. 8.8.6; and Ampelius *Lib. Mem.* 46.2, passages which indicate that Sallust had changed his mind about the idea that all was well before 146.[12] Indeed, an analysis of the circumstances in which the war broke out may have been intended to offer a lesson to Arruntius' contemporaries. Seneca's *uir rarae frugalitatis* itself, like Velleius' characterization, may have reference to his persona as a writer, as well as apparently praising his austere manners in real life.

Testimonia are arranged in order of citing authorities. The fragments are all cited in a single passage of Seneca, and it has seemed to us sensible to quote this passage in full. The individual quotations are numbered sequentially as separate fragments, as they clearly represent discontinuous extracts from the original, and in the order in which they are cited, although they probably did not occur in that order in Arruntius' work, since the fall of Panhormus in 254 (F3) is cited before the exploits of Regulus in 256 (F7).

(BML)

[12] Hoyos, *Antichthon* 23 (1989), 60–1, with n. 17.

59

M. Vipsanius Agrippa

Editions: Peter 2. lxxvii, 64–5.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 335–6; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 81–2, 100–1; R. Hanslik, 'M. Vipsanius (2) Agrippa', *RE* 9A 1 (1961), 1226–75; J.-M. Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (Rome, 1984), 103–4, 145–57, 568–71; R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, at 689–92; J. Geiger, 'The Augustan age', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 233–66, at 236–40.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa was born in the late 60s BC; his origins were obscure and lowly (he himself did not use his family name), but he appears to have been brought up with, and to have been a schoolmate of, C. Octavius (the future emperor Augustus). He accompanied Octavius to Apollonia in late 45, and it was there that news of Julius Caesar's death reached them. Agrippa assisted him with the levy of troops, was the official prosecutor of Cassius in 43, and played a major part in the war against L. Antonius. F2 on Octavian's dangers at Philippi is our only indication that he was present at the battle, though one would have expected as much. He was urban praetor in 40, and held a command in Gaul before his consulship of 37. As consul he was given the crucial task of preparing a fleet against Sex. Pompeius, and in pursuit of it he created the Portus Julius between Puteoli and Baiae (see commentary on F1). He won the two decisive engagements at Mylae and Naulochus.

In 35–34 BC he was engaged in the Illyrian Wars (see Augustus 60 F9), though the details escape us now; it would be interesting to know how Augustus and Agrippa treated each other's contributions in their autobiographies. Back in Rome he held the aedileship in 33 and began his great programme of public works (see below, and comm. on F3). He commanded the left wing at Actium in 31, and in the following years became Augustus' chief lieutenant, holding consulships in 28 and 27. He dedicated the Pantheon in 25, and possibly the Basilica of Neptune which celebrated his naval victories. It was to Agrippa, not to his son-in-law and nephew Marcellus, that Augustus offered his signet-ring when dangerously ill in 23; and after the emperor's recovery Agrippa received a five-year grant of *imperium proconsulare*.

Thereafter, Agrippa travelled across the empire; he was in the East from 23, in Gaul in 20, in Spain in 19, and again in the East from 17 to 16. In 21 he divorced his

[1] See M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa: A Biography* (Geneva and New York, 1933) and Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (1984) for full accounts of Agrippa's life with references, and briefly *OCD*[4] 1554–5.

second wife, Augustus' niece Marcella, and married Augustus' daughter Julia; two of their sons, Gaius and Lucius, were then adopted by the emperor. In 18 his *imperium proconsulare* was renewed for five years and he was granted *tribunicia potestas*, itself renewed in 13 when his *imperium* was made *maius*. He was now the equal of Augustus, in name if not in fact. In the following year he set off for the revolt in Pannonia, but fell ill on his return and died. He was buried in Augustus' Mausoleum, and accorded full honours short of deification; his will benefited the Roman people greatly, but also the imperial purse. His family connections show his centrality in imperial affairs; he was father to Gaius and Lucius Julius Caesar, whom Augustus adopted, and was father-in-law, grandfather, and great-grandfather of the emperors Tiberius, Gaius Caligula, and Nero respectively.

Works

Apart from some speeches and writings of a technical nature,[2] Agrippa's literary efforts were confined to an account of his own life (*De uita sua*), of which we possess only one certain fragment (F1), from the second book, dealing with the construction of the Portus Julius in 37 BC. He is quoted, together with Maecenas, as a source for the nature of Octavian's illness at Philippi (F2); this could be taken from the autobiography, but the matter is far from certain.[3] We have included F3 also as a possible fragment, but with some hesitation, since at first sight it might seem to come from the same source as Frontinus, *aq.* 98–9, namely the official records (*commentarii*) of Agrippa's aedileship. It is possible, however, that Pliny's phrase *aedilitatis suae commemoratione* is a reference not to a specific text (as in the Loeb: 'in the memoirs of his aedileship'), but rather to Agrippa's account of the aedileship in his autobiography (hence our translation, which we regard as closer to normal Latin usage); and if the *De uita sua* extended to 33 it almost certainly would have given an account of his extensive public works in the city of Rome, which are among his most memorable and lasting achievements. If so, it is likely that the detailed descriptions in other sources (Dio 49.43.1–5; Pliny *nat.* 36.104) also derive, directly or indirectly, from the autobiography.[4]

Beyond this it is difficult to make much headway with the nature of Agrippa's work, and it is harder still to trace its subsequent influence, since the one area where we should most expect to see it, by analogy with other autobiographies, is in military

[2] A widely admired speech about works of art is cited by Pliny *nat.* 35.26, but whether any of his forensic speeches (Plut. *Brut.* 27; Vell. 2.69.5; Sen. *contr.* 2.4.13) were published is not known. Technical writings include the records (*commentarii*) of his aedileship (Frontin. *aq.* 99) and most famously the *commentarii* which Pliny cites for geographical information, and which were used to complete a document in the Porticus Vipsaniae (Pliny *nat.* 3.17). This has usually been assumed to be a separate work, a collection of notes for, or even on, a cartographic map. Brodersen has argued that the *commentarii* (at least in a revised form) were identical with what was in the portico, that is a great inscription, giving the details of the empire now fully under Augustus' rule. K. Brodersen, *Terra Cognita: Studien zur römische Raumerfassung* (Hildesheim, 1995), 268–87, with references; K. G. Sallmann, *Die Geographie der älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro* (Berlin, 1971), 91–107.

[3] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 690. On Maecenas see I. Appendix 1, A28.

[4] Thus Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (1984), 145–57; Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 691. The most striking detail is Agrippa's famous voyage through the sewers in a boat.

narratives; but neither Appian nor Dio, on whom we rely most heavily for the military history of the period, was in the habit of naming his sources. Roddaz claims[5] to see Agrippa's influence in Appian's account of the Sicilian campaign, where unnamed friends dissuade Agrippa from trying to fight a naval battle by night at Mylae (*b.c.* 5.108.445–6), and in Dio on Marcellus' hostility to Agrippa during the crisis of 23 (53.32.1), but he may underestimate the rival Antonian versions of the triumviral period, and Syme[6] rightly points out that Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes may have coloured earlier history, including Agrippa's departure to the east. Roddaz also derives from the autobiography Seneca the Younger's recollection of a tag which Agrippa held dear: 'in peace, small things grow; in war, great things crash',[7] which could actually come from anywhere. Horace's polite refusal (*carm.* 1.6) to write a heroic poem recounting 'whatever the fierce soldier has achieved in the navy or cavalry with Agrippa as general' may, as Schanz–Hosius suggested (2[4]. 336), reflect a request made on the publication of the autobiography, and this would then pre-date the end of 23 BC. If so, Agrippa will have concluded his work about the same time as Augustus, and we might surmise that the geographical work in a sense continued the theme of military success in a different genre. But this remains speculation.

(CJS)

[5] *Marcus Agrippa* (1984), 125, 320.

[6] *RR* 342 n. 7.

[7] Sen. *epist.* 94.46: *nam concordia parvae res crescunt, discordia maximae dilabuntur.* Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (1984), 570.

60

Imperator Caesar Augustus

Editions: Peter 2. lxxi–lxxvi, 54–64; H. Malcovati, *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta*, (4th edn. Turin, 1962); L. De Biasi, A. M. Ferrero, *Gli atti compiuti e i frammenti delle opere di Cesare Augusto Imperatore* (Turin, 2003), 510–38 (fragments numbered as in Malcovati); K. Bringmann, D. Wiegandt, *Augustus: Schriften. Reden und Aussprüche* (Darmstadt, 2008), 191–205 (text and German translation).

Principal discussions: A. Weichert, *Imperatoris Caesaris scriptorum reliquiae* (Grimae, 1846; *non uidimus*); F. Blumenthal, 'Die Autobiographie des Augustus', *WS* 35 (1913), 113–30, 267–88; 36 (1914), 84–103; Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres* (1940), 23–5; A. Migheli, 'Le memorie di Augusto in Appiano, *Illyr.* 14–28', *AFLC* 31 (1953), 197–217; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 99; H. Hahn, *Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie des Kaisers Augustus* (Diss. Leipzig, 1957; *non uidimus*); H. Hahn, 'Neue Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie des Kaisers Augustus', *NClio* 10 (1958/59/60), 137–48; G. Dobesch, 'Nikolaos von Damaskus und die Selbstbiographie des Augustus', *GB* 7 (1978), 91–174; Z. Yavetz, 'The *Res Gestae* and Augustus' public image', in F. Millar, E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford, 1984), 1–36; D. Magnino, 'Una testimonianza dall'autobiografia di Augusto', *Athenaeum* 64 (1986), 501–4; R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, at 669–89; C. J. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (Swansea, 2009).

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

As countless full treatments of Augustus' life exist, rendering a detailed account unnecessary, we will here merely summarize the sequence of events covered in the autobiography itself, which concluded in 25 BC (T1). Augustus (63 BC–AD 14) Rome's first emperor, was born C. Octavius; his father was a *nouus homo* from Velitrae (Suet. *Aug.* 1–2), but through his mother he was the great-nephew of Julius Caesar, and Caesar gradually drew closer to him, eventually making him his heir and giving him his name in 45. Octavian spent the winter at Apollonia with his friend Agrippa, and there learnt of Caesar's assassination. He gathered an army, and marched to Rome to claim his inheritance (F12), and to celebrate the funeral games in honour of Julius Caesar (F1–2). With the help of Cicero (F5) he made himself appear the senate's champion against Antony, and defeated him at Mutina in 43. He demanded a consulship (F6, 13), but he was soon to change his allegiance and turn to his old enemy Antony and with Lepidus found the Triumvirate which controlled Rome for a decade. Its first acts were proscriptions of great brutality, in which Cicero was a

[1] For a summary see N. Purcell, *OCD*[4] 207–9; for a fuller account with bibliography see *CAH*[2] 10, esp. 1–197.

victim. The triumvirs divided the world between themselves; Lepidus took the west, Antony the east, and Octavian was left with Italy. He was on the winning side at Philippi when with Antony he defeated Brutus and Cassius (F7). His forces defeated L. Antonius at Perusia in 40 (F8), Sex. Pompeius at Naulochus in 36, and campaigned against the Illyrians from 35 to 33 (F9), and when the pact broke down, he defeated Mark Antony and his ally and consort Queen Cleopatra of Egypt at Actium in 31 (F10, F16). Even after this great victory he continued to campaign, leaving Agrippa and Maecenas to run Italy. He subdued Egypt over the course of 30, and remained in the East until he returned for his triple triumph in 29 (he symbolically closed the gates of Janus), and headed to Gaul in 27 after his first major constitutional settlement. In 26–25 he fought a hard campaign to settle northern Spain (the Cantabrian War), at the end of which he was voted a triumph and closed the gates of Janus for the second time.

Works

Identifying authentic fragments of the autobiography requires some care. Augustus wrote a great deal over his long career, and his position as Rome's first emperor ensured that much that bore his name (both genuine and invented) retained an interest denied to previous figures; examples include the collections of jokes and sayings presented by Quintilian (*inst.* 6.3), Plutarch (*mor.* 206F–208A), and Macrobius (2.4–5). Suetonius' privileged position gave him access to unpublished material when he wrote his biography, and memoirs like those of Julius Marathus (no. 65), a freedman official, may have given further information.

In terms of securely attested writings, a variety of personal letters are attested by Suetonius and others, largely for peculiarities of language or piquant insights into the great man's private life.[2] Cicero received letters from him; Appian and Dio knew of more public letters, and others survive epigraphically. There are a variety of edicts and decrees, and a dozen speeches; a reply to Brutus on Cato, and an encouragement to philosophy, which he used to read out, as with the autobiography (T1). He contributed to a work on geography, which probably represents a continuation of Agrippa's work (see I. 452–3). At his death there was extant a will, and he passed on three sealed rolls, one on his funeral, another the text of the *Res gestae et impensae*, and the third a statement of the empire's condition and resources. He may also have given Tiberius instructions on the government of the empire.

The consequence of this wealth, clutter almost, of evidence is that it becomes even more difficult than usual to disentangle genuine citations of Augustus' autobiography from genuine or spurious references to lost works, letters, speeches (we know that he was publishing speeches as pamphlets as early as 36 BC: Appian *b.c.* 5.130.539), or to conversation, or even to Augustus' surviving autobiographical work, the great inscription of his *Res gestae et impensae*. We have therefore distinguished between fragments securely attributed to the autobiography (F1–10) and other apparently autobiographical fragments which may have come from here, or could quite easily

[2] All the fragments are conveniently collected in Malcovati; Suet. *Aug.* 85 gives a summary.

have arisen from letters, conversations reported by others, and so forth ('possible fragments', F11–18). For the 'doubtful' F19, see commentary.

Consequently, our edition differs from its predecessors. Peter and Malcovati both hesitantly included Suet. *Caes.* 55.3–4, in which Augustus discusses the authenticity of two Caesarian speeches (F21–2 Peter, F21–2 Malcovati), and Suet. *gramm.* 16 on charges made by Augustus against Cornelius Gallus, who committed suicide in 26 BC (F23 Peter, F23 Malcovati). We know that Augustus commented on the fate of Gallus (Dio 53.23.7; Suet. *Aug.* 66.2), but not necessarily in the autobiography; Eduard Schwartz attributed these passages, perhaps rightly, to 'unveröffentlichen Privatpapieren'.[3]

Peter printed (Peter F18) but doubted, and Malcovati omitted, a remedy for problems with eyesight, which is cited by the fourth-century writer ps.-Plinius (*de medicina* 1.18 Rose) as *ex commentariis Caesaris Augusti*. In fact, the remedy is a muddled confection of bits and pieces from the Claudian writer Scribonius Largus, who gives a remedy used by Augustus (31), but not the one we find in ps.-Plinius. Peter attributed to the autobiography a few words from Isidor. *de nat. rer.* (Suetonius *prata* 244 Reiff. = Peter F24); the attribution is worthless, and Malcovati placed it among the letters (p. 26. XLVI). Peter's F16 refers to a food shortage of AD 6 and is therefore not from the memoirs. We have omitted all these passages.

It is worth adding here that Suetonius never cites anything as coming directly from the memoirs; F11, 14, 15, and 16 are all simply introduced by the verb *scribit*. Given the amount of material which Augustus left, and which Suetonius had access to, the inclusion of any of Suetonius' material in the memoirs can only be on the balance of probability; so we have included F14 because there is evidence that other memoirs had similar material; the rest refer to events which are within the chronological scope of the memoirs (see above for the omission of Peter's F16), but could equally come from another work, and F15 is the least certain of them all.

What we know with security is that Augustus' autobiography was a thirteen-book account of his life up to the end of the Cantabrian War (T1–2).[4] In Greek it is referred to as *hypomnemata* (T3; F5; F6; F7a, b, c; F8?; cf. Sulla's memoirs); in Latin, as *de uita sua* (F3), *de memoria uitae suae* (F2); *commemoratio uitae suae* (F10). F1 is the only possible verbatim citation from the work, and confirms that it was written in the first person (*consecrauimus*). The date of composition is unknown,[5] but one would expect it to have been completed not long after the end of the Cantabrian War in 25 BC; Gruen sees echoes in the presentation in the Livian tradition and in Velleius Paterculus of that war as imposing a lasting peace, when in fact it heralded another decade of 'intermittent insurrection, costly casualties and terrorism'; the work 'memorialized a capstone of the *princeps*' career', but the war would be slowly

[3] *Hermes* 33 (1898), 208 n. 4.

[4] See Lewis *ANRW* 2.34.1, 669–89, for an excellent account with full and substantial bibliography; curiously, Augustus' autobiography is not dealt with in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011). Migheli (*AFLC* 31 (1953), 210–11) appears to suggest that the work may have finished in 27, without reference to the Cantabrian War, because Appian does not appear to have referred to it in his *Iberike*; this is unacceptable.

[5] It may have been written in instalments, and brought together at a later stage. Migheli (*AFLC* 31 (1953), 109) suggests that it could not have been composed much after 22, and relates the work to Augustus' illness, but this is guesswork. See J. W. Rich in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 145–72.

forgotten over time, and barely gets a mention in the *Res gestae*.[6] So this may have been a work for the moment, but one should not underestimate the significance of the moment. The Cantabrian War led to a triumph; it was the last war Augustus undertook under his own *auspicia*; and he may have had some idea in the later 20s BC that this would be the case, since he deliberately refrained after 23 BC from holding the consulship. We get another clear indication of its character from Appian (T4). In his work on the Illyrian Wars, Appian expresses his debt to Augustus' autobiography, but notes that it was only interested in his own achievements.

According to T3, it was dedicated to his two loyal supporters, Agrippa and Maecenas, who shared some of his campaigns and kept control in Italy whilst he was away in 30 and 29. We know that Agrippa wrote a work *De uita sua* (above, no. 59), and although Maecenas' literary output is less clear, he was involved in the world of poetic tribute, so we can imagine a degree of reciprocal dedication.

In terms of the economy of the work, we know that book 2 included the funeral games for Caesar in 44 (F2), and everything else depends on the interpretation of F3, cited by Ulpian in the Digest from Book 10. If Blumenthal (*JRS* 35 (1913), 114) was right to guess at the aftermath of Actium (see comm. ad loc.), or possibly the conclusion of the Egyptian campaign, then the work would proceed at a rough average of two years to a book from 44 to 25 BC, and there would be plenty of space for the important settlement of Gaul (27 BC) and the difficult campaigns in Spain (26–25 BC), from which Augustus returned *Herculis ritu* according to Horace (*carm.* 3.14), and directed the gates of Janus to be closed.[7]

Why did Augustus write an autobiography, and what kind of work was it? In 25 BC Augustus was more secure than he had been for some time, though security was relative; there were difficulties in subsequent years. He had achieved much, and in particular could claim that he had gained military success and secured, if not expanded, the Roman empire. Since warfare seems to have been a key part of the other autobiographies which we know, it might have been thought a logical step, and one that followed at least in some sense in the footsteps of Julius Caesar. Indeed the work may have been tied more closely to these military successes, justifying the principate in terms of the establishment of external security, and looking forward to the return of Roman forces to more traditional functions. Nevertheless, it was not without risk. Augustus' early career was notorious. He had marched on Rome, demanded a consulship in return for supporting the senate against Antony, and then changed his mind. His association with Antony was marked by the bitter proscriptions, in which he allowed Antony to mark down Cicero, even though Cicero had (not entirely selflessly) supported Octavian. The bitter siege of Perusia would not be forgotten either. Nor did one have to look hard for critical and dissenting voices, even if one should not overstate their significance.[8] The fact remains that Augustus failed to eradicate the traces of his earlier career, though it is clear that he made a determined effort to put his side of the case.

[6] E. S. Gruen, *CAH*[2] 10. 164–6. It was also, though this cannot have been known at the time, Augustus' last direct involvement in warfare.

[7] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 669.

[8] K. A. Raaflaub, L. J. Samons II, 'The Opposition to Augustus', in K. A. Raaflaub, M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire* (Berkeley, 1990), 417–54.

If we look at what we know of the autobiography, one can see throughout a quite understandable determination to present its author in the best possible light, though that does not preclude a degree of honesty. There was some treatment of his 'old and rich' family, which had recently entered politics (F11). It recalls Scaurus 18 F1, and probably Sulla too (cf. Plut. *Sulla* 1), though Suetonius does suggest that Octavian spent little time on this aspect of his life. Presumably much of book 1 dealt with reactions to the death of Caesar and preparations for the journey to Rome (as in Nicolaus of Damascus, see below). Attention was given to establishing the relationship between Octavian and Julius Caesar. F12 is rendered problematic by the discrepant sum of money which is mentioned as a gift from Caesar's will, but the whole business of the bequest, prominent even in the *Res gestae* (chapter 15), must have been covered.[9] F1 shows that Augustus had a strong line on the star which appeared at the time of Caesar's funeral. In a manner somewhat reminiscent perhaps of the *Res gestae* and its stress on the faith bestowed on Augustus and the honours given to him by others, we learn that it was the *uulgus* who believed that the star marked the deification of Julius Caesar. F12 shows how Augustus may have presented the mood of the people as it turned against the assassins.

F4, F5, and F13 discuss Octavian's relationship with Cicero. The story of Cicero's dream, which allowed him to know the significance of an otherwise unknown young man, appears to have been in Augustus' own account. F5 puts the great republican statesman firmly in his place; sometimes great generals (like himself and Pompey) need a tame politician. Cicero was instrumental in delivering Pompey's great eastern commands, grain-supply commission, and was generally useful, especially after Luca. The comparison glosses over the fact that Octavian sought a command from the senate against Antony, and promptly joined Antony and betrayed the senate; there was no great command against a foreign enemy, at least not yet. F13 contains a clear criticism of Cicero's love of rule (*φιλαρχία*). As Octavian felt more and more isolated, he had to use every means at his disposal to secure the position which he believed he rightfully deserved; and he was writing from the position of having fulfilled his promises, long after the event; Antony was dead, the republic restored, the empire at peace. The fact that the senate which Octavian betrayed was driven by ignoble motives was a point in his favour. Another way of concealing the awfulness of those times was perhaps to focus on the success of this young man (F6); Augustus appears not to have been shy about the constitutional improprieties. There was no point playing down success; perhaps Augustus' model here was Sulla, as at F7 in the account of the dream that saved his life, or the portent at F18.[10]

In F14 we see how Augustus may have tried to handle some of the more lurid stories about his actions. Whatever happened to Gallius, it appears, was none of

[9] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 674 calls the will 'a point of the most crucial importance for the whole autobiography', and indeed it comes into play both at the time of Octavian's efforts to establish his position after the assassination, and in the context of the rival claims for Caesarion; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 52.2.

[10] The extent of this kind of material in the autobiography is debatable. If one excludes F4 and F18, and accepts the argument that the miracles attending Augustus' youth are not from the autobiography, one gets a rather different picture from e.g. J. Griffin in Millar, Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus* (1984), 202: 'Augustus' own autobiography ... laid great emphasis on miraculous dreams and portents'; see also I. 460 on the absence of this material from Nicolaus of Damascus. See Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 686, accepting F18.

Octavian's doing; he acted calmly and without vindictiveness. It is interesting that this version was not persuasive; neither, it appears, was the attempt to find something good to say about Octavian's rather unconvincing performance at Philippi. Augustus may have told a tale about how a dream warned him to stagger into the front line of battle and help save the day, and his own life; later sources find ways of making it a rather more inglorious affair.

The Perusine affair was also susceptible to different interpretations; F8 may present an amalgam of the Antonian defence and the Augustan version, in which the future emperor acts calmly, not in anger or bloodthirstiness. Even the presentation of Scribonia's divorce (F15), by focusing on the personal aspect, may draw attention away from the political dimensions of the marriage and its dissolution.

F9, 10, and 16 all concern war. We shall return to Appian on the Illyrian campaign. It is natural to expect a full and fully Augustan account of the war against Cleopatra, minimizing the distressing elements of civil conflict. The subservience of Roman legions to a foreign queen was a theme which others would develop (see comm. ad loc.); it is interesting that in F3 and F16 the emphasis is on the legality of Octavian's behaviour, and on giving as low an estimate of casualties as possible.

We can see therefore that the autobiography covered Augustus' youth and upbringing (F4), the marvellous events of the Ludi Caesaris (F1–2), and consistently put the dangerous and disputed actions of the triumviral period into a good light (his relationship with Cicero (F5, 13), his extraordinary consulship (F6), his military record (F9, F16), and the iniquity of Antony and Cleopatra (F10), all issues which in the late 20s were not yet dead). Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 689) attractively suggests that one coordinating feature of the work may have been the sequence of wars in which Augustus could present himself. The great campaigns in the West will have provided a less controversial and more glorious ending.

We can say more, however, by considering the extent to which the autobiography may have been followed by later sources. This is a deeply controversial topic, but some general points may be brought out, which allow us to deepen our understanding of the work as a whole and the context of the surviving fragments. One obvious place to start is Suetonius; he clearly knew and used the autobiography, but deliberately mixed positive and negative accounts, and showed off his erudition.[11] Arguments about Livy's use of the work are extremely difficult. There are a few areas of disagreement; the casualties at Actium reported by Orosius are far higher than Augustus claimed. The Livian account, however, is too badly preserved to permit us to prove anything about Livy's knowledge or use of the work, though it would seem extraordinary if he did not know it.[12] Velleius Paterculus, on the other hand, seems to know some of the same material, but also some more positive accounts, such as those including prodigies and portents; once again, we cannot say that Velleius did not use the autobiography, simply that he used other sources as well.[13]

[11] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 670 n. 133 for a list of possible unattributed borrowings, and see for a clear instance comm. on F1.

[12] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 670 n. 132 for some parallels, and a reminder that 'Livy was also capable of taking an independent line'.

[13] Ibid. 670 n. 133.

Nicolaus of Damascus wrote an account of Augustus' life (*FGrHist* 90), which has long been taken as heavily reliant on the autobiography. What we have of Nicolaus' work comes from the two manuscripts which preserve, respectively, the Byzantine excerpts *de uirtutibus et uitiis* (Tours 980), containing chapters 1–15, and *de insidiis* (El Escorial ω1.11), containing chapters 16–31.[14] Chapters 1–15 are introduced by a title which refers to ἀγωγή or upbringing, and we know from the *Suda* that Nicolaus wrote a work on the beginning of Caesar's life (ἔγραψεν . . . τοῦ βίου Καίσαρος ἀγωγήν). Chapters 19–27 are an account of the conspiracy against Julius Caesar, which does not mention Octavian at all. Jacoby provided the orthodox interpretation; Nicolaus of Damascus, who was born in 64 BC and was a noted scholar, appointed probably in the 20s to educate the surviving children of Antony and Cleopatra at Rome, wrote towards the end of that decade a *Bios Kaisaros* based heavily on the recently published *Autobiography*. A key argument was based on chapter 1, on Augustus' achievements in expanding Roman dominion over new peoples: 'before this time, men did not even know the names of these peoples, and they had been subject to no one in living memory, but he had civilized the peoples up to the Rhine, north of the Ionian sea, and the Illyrian peoples whom they call Pannonians and Dacians.' A reference to Octavian's campaigns of 35 and 34 seemed likely to Jacoby, and from 12 BC on, and even after the Varian disaster, Roman troops campaigned across the Rhine, albeit with limited success.

This has been disputed, and must now be rejected. Sophronius of Damascus gives us only the information that Nicolaus was the educator of Herod and teacher of the children of Antony and Cleopatra; in the 20s BC he was almost certainly still in the East and will have come to Rome much later than Jacoby's guess. The description of Augustus' achievements, and the absence of biographies written during the lifetime of their subject, all indicate that the work post-dates Augustus' death in AD 14. This means that Nicolaus' work is not a swift rewrite of the original, but an independent account written at some distance, and there are differences of inclusion and omission between, for instance, Nicolaus' account and that of Appian, which indicate that one cannot straightforwardly reconstruct the autobiography from Nicolaus.[15]

It is likely that Dio knew the autobiography at some level; he quotes from it (inaccurately) at F12, but he no doubt elaborated and selected to suit his own narrative purposes.[16] It is even clearer that Appian used the autobiography.[17] Appian explicitly cites Augustus' *hypomnemata*, for a dream (F7c), and as a source for

[14] See J. Bellemore, *Nicolaus of Damascus: Life of Augustus* (Bristol 1984); Jacoby *FGrHist* 90; G. Dobesch, *GB* 7 (1978), 91–174; Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 672–3, with bibliography at n. 138. On the nature of the Constantinian excerpts, see F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 1–2; P. A. Brunt, *CQ* 30 (1980), 477–94, at 483–5; see also J. M. Moore, *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius* (Cambridge, 1965), 130–4.

[15] M. Toher, *GRBS* 26 (1985), 199–206, and in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 125–44.

[16] On Dio and his sources for Augustus, see Millar, *Cassius Dio* (cit. n. 14), 34, 46, 83–102; B. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus* (Wiesbaden, 1979), with a review by C. B. R. Pelling in *Gnomon* 55 (1983), 221–6; Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate*, 6–8, 17–19; J. W. Rich in A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text* (London, 1989), 86–110; M. Reinhold, P. M. Swan in K. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire* (Berkeley, 1990), 155–73.

[17] See A. Gowing, *Triumviral Narratives*, for a comparison of both authors and full treatment of all major issues, and see esp. 39–50 for the source question.

his account of Augustus' Illyrian campaigns.[18] It cannot be excluded that there was an intermediary source in both instances, but at the same time, especially for the Illyrian campaigns, Augustus may well have been the authoritative and most extensive account. The major problem comes with F8, which is simply cited from *hypomnemata*, and the authorship remains unclear. Gowing has argued that the most plausible explanation is that Appian found a debate in Augustus which he elaborated considerably, thus producing in the end an account which will have been significantly different from that of the autobiography, but there may have been an advantage in an honest rather than a simply negative account of the opposition; see further in commentary to F8.

Appian's account of the Illyrian campaigns deserves further attention, since it appears to be a fairly direct summary of the autobiography, although Appian's capacity for reworking his sources cannot be overlooked.[19] It begins in 4.16: 'Augustus, when he had made himself master of everything, and contrasting his activity with Antony's slothfulness, recounted to the senate that he had made Italy free from the savage tribes that harassed it so often.'[20] If we take this seriously, it perhaps refers to an account given at the conclusion of fighting in 33, to which the senate responded by awarding a triumph (App. *Ill.* 28); we know from Dio 50.1 that in 33 BC Octavian and Antony were making charge and counter-charge over their conduct in foreign affairs. So the published autobiography may have comprised this military analysis, similar perhaps to the commentaries of Julius Caesar.

The account is characterized by the prominence of Octavian; he can be ruthless, as at 4.16 against pirates, but he also spares towns and holds out the promise of clemency (16, 24). He is the perfect general; he anticipates ambushes (18), leads by example, even in the face of injury (20), but brooks no cowardice from his troops (26). The account no doubt contained substantial details of tactical manoeuvres in exotic landscapes, as for instance in the account of his march though the gorge beyond Synodium, with troops marching along the mountains on either side to protect his flanks (thus avoiding the massacre that had befallen Gabinius in 48 BC; cf. 25 and 27 for other dismissive references to Gabinius). Migheli (*AFLC* 31 (1953), 205) goes so far as to compare the triple use of a word relating to triumph at 28 with the same effect at *Res gestae* 4, in reference to the same triple triumph of 29 BC. This may well be the authentic flavour of the autobiography.[21]

The picture which emerges therefore is of a work which had particular resonance at a particular time, glorifying and explaining the actions of the twenty years since the death of Julius Caesar, and addressed to the two loyal lieutenants of that time.

[18] For a brief summary of views on Appian and his sources, see D. Magnino, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 523–54.

[19] See Migheli, *AFLC* 31 (1953), 197–217, for an extensive account. Migheli (201–2) explodes Schwartz's attempt (*RE* 2. 228–9) to claim that the reference to a ditch at Siscia (Segesta) in chapter 22 must refer to a Tiberian fortification, thereby showing that Appian used an intermediary source. See also Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate*, 68 for Dio's much abbreviated account, and an extensive bibliography; Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 671, 680; G. Marasco, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 480–3.

[20] *ὁ δὲ Σεβαστὸς πάντα ἐχειρώσατο ἐντελῶς, καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ τῆς ἀπραξίας Ἀντωνίου κατελογίσατο τῇ βουλῇ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἡμερῶσαι δυσμάχων ἐθνῶν θαμινὰ ἐνοχλούντων.*

[21] It is worth mentioning in passing that Agrippa, who accompanied Octavian (App. *Ill.* 20), will surely have covered some of the same ground in his autobiography, and included later territorial developments in his geographical work; see S. Josifović, *Z.Ant* 6 (1956), 138–65 (with German summary).

It reflected the major trends in the propaganda of the period, and indeed, it may have been composed piecemeal over a long time. It had a profound impact as the definitive apologia, but it did not go unchallenged; many other accounts existed, and along with the historical imagination of subsequent authors, combined to create a far more complex picture of the young Augustus.

Testimonia are limited to those referring to Augustus' composition of the autobiography. We can make no guess at the nature of the source cited in the indices to books 3 and 4 of Pliny's *Natural History* (T5).

(CJS)

61

M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus

Editions: Peter 2. lxxviii–lxxxiii, 65–7.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865), 137–9; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 21–4; R. Hanslik, 'M. Valerius (261) Messalla Corvinus', *RE* 8A (1955), 131–57; 2389–90; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 101; Moles, *Comm.* (1979), esp. xl–xlviii, lvi–lxi; L. Duret, 'Dans l'ombre des plus grands', *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1448–72, 1533–4; A. Valvo, 'M. Valerio Messalla Corvino negli studi più recenti', *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1663–80; M. Sordi, 'La guerra di Perugia e la fonte del I.V. dei *Bella Civilia* di Appiano', *Latomus* 44 (1985), 301–16; R. Papke, '*Panegyricus Messallae* und *Catalepton* 9: Form und gegenseitiger Bezug', in P. Krafft, H. J. Tscheidel (eds.), *Concentus hexacordus* (Regensburg, 1986), 123–68; G. Zecchini, *Il carmen De Bello Actiaco* (Stuttgart, 1987), esp. 33–57; H. Leppin, 'Der Held der Dichtung: zur Selbstdarstellung Messallas', in A. E. Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex: Festschrift W. Wimmel* (Stuttgart, 1998), 181–97; K. Welch, 'Alternative memoirs: tales from the "other side" of the civil war', in C. Smith, A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus* (Swansea, 2009), 195–223; J. Geiger, 'The Augustan age', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 233–66, at 240–5.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Messalla was born in or around 64 BC, probably to M. Valerius Messalla 'Niger' (cos. 61 BC).[2] A patrician, his *cognomina* proclaimed descent from the legendary Roman champion M. Valerius Corvus, and from the conqueror of Messana in 263 BC. Poets perhaps implied a connection with P. Valerius Poplicola, consul in the first year of the republic.[3]

Messalla first appears with the younger Cicero and L. Bibulus finishing his education in Athens in 45, but had returned to Rome by June 44 and probably now

[1] See J. Hammer, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Panegyricus Messallae* (New York, 1925); J. Carcopino, *RPh* 20 (1946), 96–117; Hanslik, *RE* 8A. 131–57; 2389–90; A. Valvo, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1448–72; Syme, *AA* (1986), 200–226; Leppin in Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex* (1998), 181–97; Welch in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 200–5; cf. also R. G. M. Nisbet in A. J. Woodman, D. C. Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge, 2002), 80–92.

[2] Date of birth: see e.g. J. Hammer, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Panegyricus Messallae* (New York, 1925), 5–10; R. Helm, *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik*, *Philologus* Suppl. 21.2 (Leipzig, 1929), 47–52; also Nisbet in Woodman, Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts* (cit. n. 1), 82–3. Father: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.3, 55–6 n. 77 with A. E. Gordon, *Pottius Valerius Messalla, Consul Suffect 29* BC (Berkeley, 1954), 45 n. 78, 52.

[3] Hor. *sat.* 1.10.28 with T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (Leicester, 1974), 122–4; J. Richmond, *MPhL* 3 (1978), 194 n.21 (*contra*: O. Knorr, *CJ* 100 (2005), 393–400); [Virgil], *Catalepton* 9.39–40, assuming this refers to our Messalla, as e.g. Richmond, l.c., 189–201; Papke in Krafft, Tscheidel (eds.), *Concentus hexacordus* (1986), esp. 156 n. 50; H. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin, 1990), 14 n. 18.

began to make his mark in the courts.[4] In July 43 Cicero recommended him in the highest terms to Brutus, now in Macedonia (*ad Br.* 1.15.1–2), and it was presumably his adhesion to Brutus' cause that determined his initial proscription by the Triumvirate. That was subsequently revoked, but Messalla, like his (half-?) brother L. Gellius Poplicola, took the side of the tyrannicides and especially that of Cassius, supposedly much admired by his mother Palla.[5] He probably acquired military experience under Cassius in the East and held a subordinate command at the first battle of Philippi in 42 BC (below).

After the final republican defeat he and L. Bibulus surrendered the surviving forces on Thasos to Antony, to whom Gellius Poplicola had earlier deserted.[6] He accompanied Antony to the East and defended Herod before him at Antioch, clearly on the basis of a pre-existing connection.[7] It was possibly as quaestor that late in 40 he and L. Sempronius Atratinus, whose sister (?) married Gellius Poplicola, advocated Herod's recognition in the senate.[8]

There is no evidence or likelihood that Messalla returned to the East with Antony nor is there any basis for the common supposition that he served in the war against Sex. Pompeius in 36 as an Antonian lieutenant.[9] Messalla's role in that campaign is recorded only by Appian, who charts his hesitating grant of safe passage to Sextus' renegade admiral Menas (cf. F4) whilst acting as Agrippa's deputy at Puteoli, and the events leading up to his 'saving' of Octavian after the latter's defeat off Tauromenium.[10] Messalla was rewarded with a supernumerary augurate and presumably at some point in this period held the praetorship (his coeval and possible brother-in-law L. Bibulus was praetor designate by 36 at the latest).[11]

[4] Athens: Cic. *Att.* 12.32.2. Rome: Cic. *Att.* 15.17.2. Courts: Quint. *inst.* 12.11.28. However, the Aufidia case (e.g. Hanslik *RE* 8A. 137) may belong to the 30s: Syme, *RP* 3. 1416–20.

[5] Proscription: App. *b.c.* 4.38.159; 5.113.471; Dio 47.11.4; 49.16.1; Hinard, *Proscriptions*, 540–1. Revocation: App. *b.c.* 4.38.159. The widow and/or son of Q. Pedius (cos. 43) may have been among the relatives who interceded on his behalf (cf. Pliny *nat.* 35.21 for the relationship). L. Gellius Poplicola: Dio 47.24.3–6 (also for Messalla's own friendship with Cassius); Livy *per.* 122 with Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (cit. n. 3), 119–125; E. Badian in N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday* (*BICS* Suppl. 51, 1988), 8 with n. 11. Mother: Dio 47.24.6 with R. G. Austin on Cic. *Cael.* 23 (3rd edn., Oxford, 1960).

[6] Surrender: App. *b.c.* 4.38.160; 5.113.471 (from Messalla's own memoir according to J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy* (Cambridge, 2006), 104); cf. Vell. 2.71.1; M.-C. Ferriès, *Les Partisans d'Antoine* (Bordeaux, 2007), 169–170. Poplicola: Dio 47.24.6.

[7] Jos. *BJ* 1.243; *AJ* 14.325; cf. Cassius' favour towards Herod in 43: Jos. *BJ* 1.218–235; *AJ* 14.271–293; N. Biffi, *Orpheus* 15 (1994), 461.

[8] Jos. *BJ* 1.285; *AJ* 14.384 (with *MRR* 3. 213–4). Cf. also Mommsen, *Staatsr.*[3] 2. 553–4. Poplicola's wife: *IG* 2/3[2].4320–1; E. Badian, *PACA* 11 (1968), 5–6 n. 22; M. Kajava in H. Solin, M. Kajava (eds.), *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History* (Helsinki, 1990), 72–4.

[9] See P. Tansey, *Latomus* 66 (2007), 882–90. Note that Messalla's son Messallinus was probably conceived in the early 30s (H. Musurillo in P. T. Brannan (ed.), *Classica et Iberica: Festschrift Joseph M.-F. Marique* (Worcester, Mass., 1975), 111 n. 10; Syme, *RP* 3. 1085, 1420).

[10] App. *b.c.* 5.102.423–5; 103.427; 105.434; 110.457; 112.467–470; cf. M. Hadas, *Sextus Pompey* (New York, 1930), 129–37.

[11] Augurate: Dio 49.16.1; perhaps *ILS* 4977; F. Cairns, *PLILS* 10 (1998), 207 n. 21; 230–1 (=id., *Papers on Roman Elegy 1969–2003* (Bologna, 2007), 364 n. 21, 384); *Emerita* 67 (1999), 227–8 (=*Papers*, 347–8); Nisbet in Woodman, Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts* (cit. n. 1), 83–4, 224 n. 54. Bibulus: M. Amandry, *SNR* 65 (1986), 76–80; id., *SNR* 69 (1990), 80–83. Possible relationship to Messalla: see esp. Syme, *RP* 6. 201.

If the *Panegyricus Messallae* can be trusted, he took part in Octavian's Illyrian campaigns of 35–34 and conducted some operations himself.[12] Whether these constitute the campaign against the Salassi recorded by Appian and Dio[13] is uncertain, but Messalla had clearly increasingly attached himself to Caesar's heir. Appian's assertion (*b.c.* 4.38.161) that Messalla decisively moved from Antony to Octavian in disgust at Antony's 'enslavement' to Cleopatra is probably schematic and a reflection of Messalla's own subsequent justification of his conduct: it was in his interest (as that of many others) to maintain good relations with both triumvirs as long as possible.[14] The decisive break may have come as late as 32, when Messalla was designated consul for 31, in Antony's place (App. *b.c.* 4.38.161) and as Octavian's colleague, at a notably early age. Messalla's own attacks on Antony (at least partially probably in response to Antony's attacks on him, no doubt for betraying his benefactor) may well belong to this context.[15]

Messalla held a subordinate command at the battle of Actium (Plut. *Brut.* 40.11; App. *b.c.* 4.38.161), and enjoyed further advancement in the years immediately following. He and Agrippa were given (and accepted) Antony's house on the Palatine,[16] and he was appointed to the newly revived Arval Brethren.[17] Messalla either served as governor of Syria or was given a special commission to deal with Antony's gladiators who had occupied a fashionable quarter of Antioch.[18] His (probably subsequent) governorship in Gaul and victory over the Aquitani earned him a triumph on 15 September 27 BC.[19] There followed his appointment to, and hasty departure from, the post of city prefect,[20] a contentious episode which allows no certain explanation but had no apparent effect on Messalla's relations with the princeps. In 25 he was handsomely recompensed for the destruction of Antony's

[12] *Pan. Mess.* 107–17 with e.g. R. Hanslik, *AAWW* 89.2 (1952), 27 8. Tränkle's doubts (*Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin, 1990), 18–19) appear ill-founded.

[13] App. *Illyr.* 17.50 (not necessarily dating the campaign after Actium); Dio 49.38.3 (34 BC); cf. Strabo 205; recent bibliography in P. Tansey, *Latomus* 66 (2007), 888 n. 32.

[14] Cf. Syme, *AA* 207; *RP* 6. 251; Leppin in Radke (ed.), *Candide index* (1998), 186.

[15] For these see *ORF*[4] 176 F16–19; J. Carcopino, *RPh* 20 (1946), 116; N. Biffi, *Sileno* 20 (1994), 161–74. They certainly include 'On Antony's statues' and 'In reply to Antony's letter.' If '*de uectigalium Asiae constitutione*' ('concerning the fixing of the tribute of Asia'), cited by Charis. 186 from Messalla, was the title of a speech or other work by Messalla, it may belong here or have been a much earlier positive report on Antony's actions at Ephesus in 41 (as Gabba, *Appiani b.c. lib. V* (Florence, 1970), xvi, 14; for Messalla's own patronage of Ephesus see *AE* (1993), 1476 = *SEG* 45. 775).

[16] Dio 53.27.5; cf. Tac. *ann.* 11.7.2; Papi, *LTUR* 2. 34.

[17] J. Scheid, *Les Frères arvales* (Paris, 1975), 50–8, 335–61; id., *Romulus et ses frères* (Rome, 1990), 690–708; U. Schmitzer, *WS* 106 (1993), 117–18, 128–9; F. Cairns *PLLS* 10 (1998), 227–31 (=id., *Papers on Roman Elegy 1969–2003* (Bologna, 2007), 382–4); id., *Emerita* 67 (1999), 224–8 (=*Papers*, 345–8).

[18] Dio 51.7.7. On the problematic evidence of Tib. 1.3.1–4; 1.7.13–22 see esp. F. Cairns, *Tibullus* (Cambridge, 1979), 43–4.

[19] Gaul: Tib. 1.7.3–12; 2.1.33; App. *b.c.* 4.38.161; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 21.1; Eutr. 7.9; *epit. Caes.* 1.7 (earlier date: P. E. Knox, *CQ* 55 (2005), 206–8, over-pressing Appian l.c.). Triumph: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.86; Tib. 1.7.5–9; 2.1.33; App. l.c.; perhaps [Virg.] *Catalepton* 9.3 (cf. Papke in Krafft, Tschiedel (eds.), *Concentus hexacordus* (1986), 147 with n. 78).

[20] Tac. *ann.* 6.11.3; Hieron. *chron.* 164 (26 BC). For recent bibliography see S.-A. Fusco, *Index* 26 (1998), 307–10; M. H. Dettenhofer, *Herrschaft und Widerstand im augusteischen Principat* (Stuttgart, 2000), 89–92; cf. most recently Welch in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 216 n. 57.

house by fire and his elder son was soon appointed Quindecimvir at an early age, later reaching the consulship in 3 BC.[21]

Messalla's own active political career was now over but at Agrippa's death in 12 BC he was appointed the first *curator aquarum* (assisted by his nephew) and in 2 BC formally proposed the conferment on Augustus of the title of Pater Patriae, a source of honour perhaps to himself as well as the princeps.[22] His death, no later than AD 13, did nothing to impede the political careers of his descendants.[23]

Messalla no doubt maintained a show of aristocratic pride and independence. Around and after Actium poets closely associated with him (or others who so represented themselves) sang his praises in extravagant terms appropriate to, or exceeding, those of a Pompey, Caesar, or even Alexander, whilst passing over Octavian in silence.[24] Messalla himself fiercely defended his lineage from would-be intruders, celebrated a particularly resplendent triumph in 27, openly acknowledged his service under Cassius, and reputedly informed Octavian that he had always supported the better cause.[25] Yet the facts of his career demonstrate a pragmatic awareness of political realities and his own self-interest that discourages any suggestion that he opposed the new political order on principle: that Agrippa had been the lead prosecutor against Cassius in 43 did not preclude a later close association with him, and Messalla and his sons were careful to cultivate their connections not only with Augustus but with his eventual successor Tiberius.[26]

Works

Aside from producing some probably insignificant verse of his own,[27] Messalla befriended a wide range of poets (including Horace, Tibullus, and Ovid), particularly in the 30s and 20s, and as a literary critic showed the fastidious intellect that reputedly marked all his cultural activities (and perhaps his conduct in general).[28] However, his principal distinction was in oratory, where he made his mark early and is often paired

[21] House: Dio 53.27.5. Son as Quindecimvir: Tib. 2.5; *ILS* 5050.152 (17 BC); cf. Pliny *nat.* 34.22 with Hanslik, *RE* 8A. 154; Leppin in Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex* (1998), 185 with n. 33.

[22] *Curator Aquarum*: Frontin. *aq.* 99; F. Coarelli, *Revixit Ars* (Rome, 1996), 337. Nephew: Syme, *RP* 3. 1420. Pater Patriae: Suet. *Aug.* 58.1–2 with Zecchini, *Il carmen De Bello Actiaco* (1987), 76–7; cf. also Ovid *trist.* 4.4.13.

[23] On the (contentious) date of death see e.g. R. J. Jeffreys, *SLLRH* 1 (1979), 373–5; id., *CQ* 35 (1985), 140–8; Syme, *AA* 217–26. Descendants: see esp. Syme, o.c. 230–43 with Table IX and *RP* 7. 480.

[24] Papke in Krafft, Tschiedel (eds.), *Concentus hexacordus* (1986), 126–34; Leppin in Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex* (1998), 189–95. Not, however, to be interpreted as implicit hostility to the new political order: cf. esp. Papke 133–4.

[25] Lineage: Pliny *nat.* 35.8. Triumph: Tib. 1.7.7–8 with Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 70–1; V. Fadinger in N. Ehrhardt, L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand–Anpassung–Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom* (Stuttgart, 2002), 182 n. 128. Cassius: Tac. *ann.* 4.34.4 (T1). Octavian: Plut. *Brut.* 53.3.

[26] Agrippa: J.-M. Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (Rome, 1984), 225. Tiberius: Suet. *Tib.* 70.1; Syme, *AA* 232–8.

[27] Cf. *Catalepton* 9.13–38 (apparently referring to pastoral written in Greek); Pliny *epist.* 5.3.5; A. Rostagni in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* (Florence, 1960), 827 (=id., *Virgilio minore* (2nd edn., Rome, 1961), 421); Duret, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1452–3; Nisbet in Woodman, Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts* (cit. n. 1), 88–92; A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford, 2007), 294. Cf. also Virg. *ecl.* 5.11; 7.21–8 with Hollis, o.c. 293–4 and bibliography there cited.

[28] Literary criticism: Sen. *suas.* 2.20; Suet. *gramm.* 4.2. Fastidiousness: Sen. *contr.* 2.4.8.

with Pollio, clearly as the leading practitioners of their age.[29] His style invited comparison with Cicero: a softer, more ornate version of his putative mentor's manner, lacking strength and intellectual vigour but characterized by authority and above all lucidity and refinement.[30] His precision and purity of Latin diction, including the avoidance of Graecisms, attracted particular notice and were reflected both in his allied grammatical studies and in his 'translations' of Greek oratory, which demonstrated the capacity of Latin to match the precision of the Greek originals.[31]

No source records any historical writing by Messalla. Its existence is inferred primarily from F1–3 (on the first battle of Philippi), which cannot be plausibly accommodated within his attested works (including the attacks on Antony[32]). That has been variously reinforced with other considerations:

(i) In Tac. *ann.* 4.34.4 (T1) Cremutius Cordus includes Messalla's (repeated) acknowledgement of his service under Cassius among the precedents for his own praise of the tyrannicides in his history. The context implies that Messalla's declaration appeared in published work, almost certainly historiographical in form.[33]

(ii) The *Panegyricus Messallae* 5–6 declares that Messalla alone has the ability adequately to record his own deeds. That has been interpreted as an oblique reference to an existing historical work by Messalla, which has consequently been deemed essentially autobiographical.[34] However, even on the (contentious) assumption that the *Panegyricus* post-dates that work,[35] it need imply at most only that the latter included actions of his own and demonstrated his capacity in this genre, not that his deeds were its main focus.

(iii) The prominent role accorded to Messalla in Appian's account of parts of the Sicilian campaign of 36 BC (above) has prompted suggestions that Messalla is himself

[29] Early distinction: Cic. *Brut.* 1.15.1; Quint. *inst.* 12.11.28. Paired with Pollio: Vell. 2.36.2; Quint. *inst.* 12.11.28; also Sen. *contr.* 3 praef. 14–5; Quint. *inst.* 10.1.24; 113; Tac. *ann.* 11.6.2; 7.2.

[30] Quint. *inst.* 1.7.35; 10.1.113; 12.10.11; Tac. *dial.* 18.2; 21.9; cf. Tib. 1.7.8 with R. Maltby, *Tibullus, Elegies* (Cambridge, 2002), ad loc.; 1.7.51–2; 63–4 with J. Booth, R. Maltby, *Mnemosyne* ser. 4.58 (2005), 126–7; Ovid *Pont.* 2.2.49; cf. also Syme, *AA* 242.

[31] Diction: see esp. Hor. *sat.* 1.10.27–30 with schol. ad loc.; Sen. *contr.* 2.4.8; also Suet. *Tib.* 70.1 with Lebek, *Verba prisca*, 55 n. 31. Grammatical discussions: Funaioli, *GRF* 503–7; A. Biedl, *WS* 46 (1928), 100–1; Duret, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1527. Translations: Quint. *inst.* 10.5.2 with Duret 1510; S. Swain in J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society* (Oxford, 2002), 135.

[32] Peter oddly included the fragments attributed or attributable to these attacks (2. 67 F7–10; cf. lxxx), though rightly rejecting Münzer's attribution of them to a (virulently partisan) historical work (Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 406). When Pliny cites Messalla as a source for books 9 and 33 of the *Natural History*, the relevant material probably comes from these polemics (cf. Münzer 406–7). For book 35 the reference is to Messalla's *Indignatio* (*nat.* 35.8).

[33] Cf. e.g. Valvo, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1664 n. 9; J. L. Butrica, *SLLRH* 7 (1994), 290–1; Welch in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 211 n. 6. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2 (1956), 101 n. 8, argues that Cremutius refers to oral utterances.

[34] Cf. R. Hanslik, *AAWW* 2 (1952), 27; H. Schoonhoven, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1683–4; Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin, 1990), 187. *Contra*: Leppin in Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex* (1998), 190 n. 66.

[35] The *Panegyricus* purports to be a work of 31 BC and is commonly accepted as such. Arguments for a later date (e.g. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin, 1990), esp. 15–16, 174–183) depend largely on disputed echoes of later writers. If Messalla's work covered his whole career (as Welch in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 207–8), it can hardly have been composed before his triumph of 27 BC (ibid.).

Appian's immediate or ultimate source.[36] This is plausible but not proven. Messalla may have provided other historians of the period with information about his own experiences privately, and his prominence in this section of Appian's account must in part reflect Appian's own preoccupation with the moralizing theme of Messalla 'saving' one of those who had proscribed him (Octavian): after that episode Messalla disappears entirely from view.

If any of F4–6 could be confidently attributed to our work, they would suggest a wider-ranging historical narrative going well beyond Philippi, but these fragments may belong elsewhere in Messalla's output (see comm. ad loc.), and attempts to detect Messalla behind one or more of our other existing narratives, e.g. on the Perusine War or Actium,[37] are mere speculation. We therefore have no firm evidence either that Messalla wrote a full-scale history of the triumviral period[38] or that he wrote an autobiography in the conventional sense.[39] However, T1 would show that his work was at least a personal memoir if, as JB persuasively suggests, the verb *praedicabat* here means 'call' rather than 'praise' (as *TLL* 10.2.554.4). If, as is likely, the passage alludes to Messalla's historical work, it implies that Messalla regularly there referred to Cassius as 'my commander' (*imperator meus*) and so wrote in the first person.

F1–3 imply that whilst Messalla included some personal reminiscence, this was in the context of a more general account of the first battle of Philippi which emphasised the resolution shown by Cassius and the victory of the republicans and presented its author as an eyewitness both observant of significant detail and scrupulous in differentiating what he could assert as fact and what as conjecture. That matches other aspects of Plutarch's account of the battle in the *Brutus*. These include episodes in which Messalla played a significant role (40.10–11; 41.5) and the whole thrust of his narrative: Plutarch presents the battle from a clearly republican perspective, with a more favourable portrayal of Cassius than appears hitherto in the *Brutus*,[40] and his account elaborates the implication of F1 that the republicans had now determined on a decisive battle, albeit with some reluctance and misgivings on Cassius' part.[41] Hence Messalla, an eyewitness and significant player in the battle, is generally identified as the principal source of Plutarch's version.[42] Admittedly his account is in sharp

[36] See esp. Gabba, *Appiani b.c. lib. V* (Florence, 1970), xv, 172–3; Gowing, *Triumviral Narratives*, 40; J. Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy* (Cambridge, 2006), 302; Welch in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 206–7 (also suggesting the memoir as a possible source of Appian's account of Messalla's campaign against the Salassi in *Ill.* 17.50).

[37] Sordi, *Latomus* 44 (1985), 316; Zecchini, *Il carmen De Bello Actiaco* (1987), 33–57. *Contra*: J.-M. Roddaz, *Historia* 37 (1988), 321 n.36; M.-L. Freyburger and J.-M. Roddaz, *Dion Cassius, Histoire Romaine 50–1* (Paris, 1991), xv (not refuted by Zecchini, *Prometheus* 20 (1994), 46–9); Gowing, *Triumviral Narratives*, 321–2.

[38] He is not, for example, among the (Latin) historians quoted in Sen. *suas.* 6.14–25 for the death or epitaph of Cicero.

[39] There are no grounds for attributing Suet. *Aug.* 58.2 (2 BC) to this work (as e.g. Hanslik, *RE* 8A. 155): see Duret, *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1534 n. 596.

[40] See Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 500–2. There is, however, some criticism in 43.2 and some favourable material earlier (Moles, *Comm.* 336, on *Brut.* 29.1, citing also 9.1–4; 30.2; 34.7–8; 37.6).

[41] See the anecdotal account of the republican council in 39.7–11.

[42] e.g. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 137–9; id., *HRR* 2. lxxxi–lxxxiii; Moles, *Comm.* xl–xlix, lvii–lix, 418–24, 431–2; cf. 449–50, 457, 479–80; A. M. Gowing, *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 159, 175; Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 15; Welch in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 206 with n. 68. That he was the source of Appian's (Antonian) account (as, tentatively, Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy* (cit. n. 36), 95 n. 112) is most improbable.

contrast to Appian's where the initiative lies entirely with Antony, who responds to Cassius' cutting of his entrenchment in the marshland by a surprise attack; that in turn provokes Brutus' troops into an unauthorized assault on Octavian's forces on the other wing (*b.c.* 4.110.461–3; cf. 117.490). Appian's circumstantial account is commonly accepted without demur. However, specific details in Plutarch[43] suggest that his version is not a wholesale apologetic fabrication in the interests of the republicans and specifically Cassius,[44] but contains elements of a credible defence of the republican commanders: they perhaps anticipated Antony's attack and determined that, should it materialize, they would take advantage of Octavian's less experienced forces[45] (and the incapacity of their commander) to launch their own offensive.[46] In Plutarch, and perhaps already in Messalla, this contingency plan[47] has then become a firm decision to fight that day.

Precisely how much of Plutarch's account of the first or second battle derives from Messalla it is impossible to determine.[48] It seems unlikely, for example, that Messalla was so implicitly self-critical in his account of the indiscipline and short-sightedness of Brutus' right wing in the first engagement as Plutarch himself is (*Brut.* 41.4–6; 42.2; 44.6; cf. 46.1; App. *b.c.* 4.117.491), but there is nothing to justify Mazzarino's supposition[49] that he sought to represent himself as responsible for the defeat of Octavian's forces. If Plutarch does reflect Messalla's account to any degree, he appears to have sought to counter Antonian versions of the battle,[50] to justify in particular the conduct of Cassius,[51] perhaps in reaction to hostile accounts of his former commander[52] and/or eulogies of Brutus which worked to Cassius' disadvantage, and to emphasize the chance factors that led to Cassius' suicide and so played a significant role in the republicans' eventual defeat.[53] What he was writing was perhaps a memoir,

[43] Above all, the reassignment of a legion under Messalla from Cassius' force to that of Brutus (*Brut.* 40.10–11).

[44] A possibility raised but rejected by Moles, *Comm.* 419.

[45] W. C. G. Schmitthenner, 'The Armies of the Triumviral Period', DPhil. Thesis, Oxford (1958), 54.

[46] Cf. M. Gelzer, *RE* 10, 1015; K.-M. Kniely, *Quellenkritische Studien zur Tätigkeit des M. Brutus im Osten* (Vienna, 1974), 232; Moles, *Latomus* 42 (1983), 767–8.

[47] Cassius' invitation to Messalla to join him in celebrating his birthday (F1) perhaps implies that, at the time the invitation was issued, he was not expecting an engagement that day (cf. D. Magnino, *Appiani b.c. lib. IV* (Como, 1998), 250).

[48] The anecdote in 45.6–9 may imply that Messalla's narrative did not conclude with the first battle, and Peter plausibly infers from 53.1 that the alternative version of Brutus' death in 52.8 derives from Messalla (Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 139; id., *HRR* 2. lxxxi). The manner of Messalla's introduction in 53.1, however, perhaps suggests that the anecdote recounted there does not come from our work; likewise the vague indication of source for the story of Messalla at Actium in 53.3.

[49] Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1. 401.

[50] His attacks on Antony in the late 30s do not, however, justify the conclusion that his work showed partisan hostility to Antony and therefore the possible attribution to him of the accusation of cowardice in *Ant.* 22.3; *Brut.* 42.3 (Moles, *Comm.* xli–xlii; Pelling on Plut. *Ant.*, 172): both passages imply that this is derived from a supplementary source. For the (equally unjustified) opposite assumption of an Antonian perspective see W. Soltau, *Appians Bürgerkriege*, *Philologus* Supplbd 7.4 (1899), 622–3; Sordi, *Latomus* 44 (1985), 301–16; Zecchini, *Il carmen De Bello Actiaco* (1987), esp. 43–5. For material favourable to Antony in the account of Philippi in the *Brutus* see esp. 50.1–9; also 53.4 (= *Ant.* 22.6–8).

[51] Messalla may have set much store by such demonstrations of *pietas* (cf. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 258; Leppin in Radke (ed.), *Candide iudex* (1998), 188–9), not least as a means of distinguishing himself from those who opportunistically forswore past allegiances.

[52] For later traditions hostile to Cassius see Rawson, *Roman Culture*, 490–6, 506–7, much presumably going back to contemporary polemics.

[53] Cf. Moles, *Comm.* lix–lx; Pelling on Plut. *Ant.*, 171.

enlivened by colourful anecdote and covering events in which he had played only a subordinate role but on which he could claim the authority to correct accounts written with a different agenda; his descendant Vipstanus Messalla (no. 86) may have followed his example in a later civil war.

Unless any of F5–7 is a direct citation from our work, we do not know whether he wrote in Latin or Greek.[54] Nor can the date of the work be established.[55] Peter supposed that the common citation of Augustus' autobiography by Plutarch (*Ant.* 22.2; *Brut.* 41.7–8=(60) F7b, a) and, in a loose and misleading summary, Appian (*b.c.* 4.110.463=(60) F7c) derived from Messalla and that he therefore wrote after 23 BC (Peter's date for the autobiography),[56] but that is an unnecessary inference, especially as there is no specific reason to suppose that the citation comes from Messalla and the autobiography may have been published in instalments.[57]

Messalla, Appian, and Philippi

F3 is repeated in App. *b.c.* 4.112.471 from an (unnamed) source, one of a number of shared motifs in their accounts of Philippi,[58] where Appian and Plutarch are remarkably close in both structure and expression of thought.[59] These are generally thought to reflect either direct use of a common source by both authors (more problematic in this instance since Plutarch and Appian give such contrasting accounts of the battle itself) or, where Messalla is the attested or probable source, direct use of him by Plutarch and indirect by Appian[60] (making the closeness of the parallels and e.g. common reference to a source for F3 remarkable). The simpler hypothesis, that in some of these cases at least (including F3) Appian knew and used Plutarch,[61] is usually discounted on the grounds that in some cases elsewhere where they include parallel

[54] With considerable reservations we have included F6–7 as possible fragments of Messalla's work, although they probably derive from elsewhere in his output, as may F4–5 (see comm. ad loc.). We have not included Messalla's use of *uectigalium* (Charis. 186=*ORF*^{4} 176 F19, commonly assumed to be part of the title of a speech or pamphlet: see n. 15) nor his use of *cognomentum* (Sen. *suas.* 2.17=*ORF*^{4} 176 F23), *gladiola* (Quint. *inst.* 1.6.42=*ORF*^{4} 176 F24), or *reatum* (Quint. *inst.* 8.3.44=*ORF*^{4} 176 F25), since the focus of the citing sources (and in the last case the sense) make derivation from Messalla's oratory overwhelmingly probable. Similarly in the case of *funambulum* in Schol. Cruq. Hor, *sat.* 1.10.28 (=*ORF*^{4} 176 F27) the context in Horace explicitly concerns Messalla's forensic usage.

[55] F6 might imply composition after Actium but before 21 BC, but neither inference is certain and the attribution of the fragment itself highly disputable: see comm. ad loc.

[56] Peter 2. lxxviii.

[57] J. W. Rich in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 160–1.

[58] Cf. also F1 with comm. on Cassius' birthday. In *b.c.* 4.124.520 Appian ascribes to Brutus a comparison of himself with Pompey the Great as Messalla does to Cassius (F1). Appian (or a source) may have conjured up the comparison independently or have transferred to Brutus and to a plausible context in his own narrative a motif which, when spoken by Cassius, was at odds with the account of the initial engagement that Appian himself follows: cf. Moles, *Comm.* 424–6; id., *Latomus* 42 (1983), 771–2; see also A. M. Gowing, *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 178.

[59] See esp. Plut. *Brut.* 36.5–7=App. *b.c.* 4.134.565; *Brut.* 39.3–5=*b.c.* 4.134.563; *Brut.* 41.7–8 (cf. *Ant.* 22.2)=*b.c.* 4.110.463 (Augustus (60) F72–c); *Brut.* 43.5–8=*b.c.* 4.113.474; *Brut.* 46.1=*b.c.* 4.118.498; *Brut.* 48.4=*b.c.* 4.128.532 (Volumnius 47 F1); *Brut.* 48.5=*b.c.* 4.134.566. Cf. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 138; *HRR* 2. lxxxii; E. Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 653–4; Moles, *Comm.* li–lii.

[60] Cf. E. Kornemann, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896) 653–4; Moles, *Comm.* xliii–xliv, xlviii–xlix, lviii–lix; *Latomus* 42 (1983), 772–3; *AJPh* 104 (1983), 252.

[61] On Appian's knowledge of Plutarch see Pelling, *Plutarch and History*, 35 n. 69, 36 n. 75, with bibliography there cited; C. S. Bucher, *TAPhA* 130 (2000), 452–3.

material, Appian has additional data not found in Plutarch.[62] This does not, however, exclude the possibility that in other instances Appian drew directly on Plutarch, and one later parallel is potentially telling in this regard. In *Ant.* 22.6–8 Plutarch gives an extended account of Antony's treatment of Brutus' body which appears in abbreviated form in *Brut.* 53.4, but with the added detail of the dispatch of Brutus' ashes to Servilia. On current hypotheses the extended version should have stood in the immediate or ultimate common source. However, Appian himself (*b.c.* 4.135.568) reproduces, with further abbreviation but close verbal and structural parallelism, the summary version in *Brut.* 53.4, including the dispatch of the ashes.[63] The obvious inference, that Appian used the *Brutus* to supplement a source of very different character,[64] receives further support from Peter's observation that much of this common material looks like a supplement to Appian's basic narrative[65] and from the fact that in every instance but one where Appian signals the existence of a rival or supplementary version in his account of Philippi, that version appears in Plutarch.[66] How far, therefore, Appian had independent access to Messalla's material must remain uncertain.

(AD)

[62] Here, however, the eerie silence of the birds in *b.c.* 4.134.563 may be Appian's own contribution, as may the condensation and narrative reworking of the account of Lucilius' heroism in *b.c.* 4.129.542–5 (cf. Plut. *Brut.* 50.1–9). The eagle omen in Plut. *Brut.* 48.4 and App. *b.c.* 4.128.532 offers a further parallel but Appian's more dramatic setting is found in other sources (see Volumnius 47 F1 comm.) and so is presumably independent of Plutarch (who here cites Volumnius directly and does not therefore depend on a source shared with Appian). In one other significant example in this narrative (Plut. *Brut.* 51.1; App. *b.c.* 4.130.547) Appian probably also adds further material independently: cf. comm. on Volumnius 47 F2. Pelling in Smith and Powell (eds.), *Lost Memoirs* (2009), 52–3 argues that the common citation of Augustus' autobiography (60 F7a–c) in Plut. *Brut.* 41.7–8 (cf. *Ant.* 22.2) and App. *b.c.* 4.110.463 derives from a shared source (Pollio) but admits the possibility that they included the story independently (and how much weight can be placed on Appian's vague 'guarding against the day' (*φυλαξαμένου τὴν ἡμέραν*) is perhaps doubtful).

[63] Cf. App. *b.c.* 2.18.65, where Appian adopts Plutarch's erroneous attribution of Africa to Pompey under the *lex Trebonia* (55 BC) in *Pomp.* 52.4; *Cato Min.* 43.1, ignoring the correct account in *Crass.* 15.7.

[64] Cf. his similar procedure in his account of the Catilinarian conspiracy (*b.c.* 2.2.4–7.23): Drummond, *Law, Politics and Power* (Stuttgart, 1995), 24 with bibliography.

[65] Peter 2. lxxxii; cf. Moles, *Comm.* xliii–xliv, xlv.

[66] Cf. App. *b.c.* 4.112.471 (*Brut.* 45.1 (F3)); 113.474 (*Brut.* 43.4–9); 118.498 (*Brut.* 46.1); 130.547 (*Brut.* 51.1). On the exception (the second citation in *b.c.* 4.130.547) see comm. on Volumnius 47 F2.

62

T. Labienus

Principal discussions: Peter, *Gesch. Lit.* 1 (1897), 295–6; H. Dessau, *PIR* (1897), L 9; Peter 2. c–ci; W. Kroll, 'T. Labienus (8)', *RE* 12 (1925), 270–1; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 344–5; Syme, 'The allegiance of Labienus', *JRS* 28 (1938), 113–25, at 113 (= *RP* 1. 62); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 96; L. Petersen, *PIR*² (1970), L 19.

INTRODUCTION

The Augustan orator and historian T. Labienus was no doubt a member of the well-known Picene family that produced Caesar's chief lieutenant, also named T. Labienus, who defected to Pompey at the start of the civil war out of personal loyalty.[1] Our Labienus may have been his son, and brother of the Q. Labienus who led a Parthian invasion of Syria before being defeated and killed by P. Ventidius in 39.

Most of our information about the orator and historian comes from a passage of the elder Seneca's *Controuersiae* (10 *praef.* 4–8, reproduced in full here as T2). From this we learn that his declamations were widely admired[2] although he himself was generally disliked, and his success was achieved in spite of poverty and ill-repute. Embittered and sharp-tongued (T1), he apparently attacked people of all classes indiscriminately, and earned the nickname 'Rabienus'. He retained his Pompeian sympathies and expressed them passionately. Whether for personal or political reasons (or both), his published works were publicly burned on the orders of the senate,[3] and he himself committed suicide after shutting himself in his family tomb.

Among the banned works was a history (thus, implicitly, T3), which evidently contained passages so offensive that even their outspoken author regarded them as too dangerous for recitation during his lifetime (T2 §8). This almost certainly means that the work dealt (in whole or in part) with recent events, and probably that it was flagrantly 'Pompeian'.[4] Beyond that we know nothing of its scope, content, or

[1] Firmly established by Syme, *RP* 1. 62–75. A family relationship with Labienus the orator and historian is asserted at 75 n. 1.

[2] See Seneca *contr.* 10.4.17–18 for an example of his forceful declamatory style, with J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge, 1981), 192–3.

[3] The attack was instigated by his enemies (T2 §5), one of whom subsequently suffered the same fate (T2 §7); this was presumably his bitter enemy Cassius Severus (T2 §8), whose works were also burned, as we learn from T3, although it is odd that Seneca does not name him in T2 §5 or §7 (they are differentiated by C. A. Forbes, *TAPhA* 67 (1936), 122–3). The dating of these events is uncertain. Dio records the public burning of offensive literature under AD 12 (56.27); this may have been the occasion for the burning of Labienus' books, in which case Cassius Severus' would have been banned subsequently, perhaps under Tiberius. On the other hand the burning recorded by Dio may not have been the first of its kind. In that case we could date the burning of Labienus' works earlier in Augustus' reign, and of Cassius Severus' in AD 12. R. A. Bauman, *Impietas in Principem* (Munich, 1974), 28–31, places the conflagration mentioned by Dio in AD 8, and argues that it consumed the works of both Labienus and Cassius Severus.

[4] Syme describes it as 'in subject and treatment unacceptable to the government' (*RP* 1. 62).

character. Other known works (also presumably burnt) include a speech in a case involving the heirs of one Urbinia, in which Pollio spoke against him (Quint. *inst.* 1.5.8; 4.1.11; Diomedes *GL* 1.376.8), and a pamphlet attacking Bathyllus, a freedman of Maecenas (T2 §8).

Two quotations from unspecified works of Labienus are printed here as 'possible fragments', on the grounds that they could be from the history; for further discussion see commentary ad locc.

(TJC)

63

C. Julius Hyginus

Editions: Ch. B. Bunte, *De C. Iulii Hygini, Augusti liberti, uita et scriptis* (Diss. Marburg, 1846); Funaioli, *GRF* (1907), 1. 525–37; Peter 2. ci–cvii, 72–7.

Principal discussions: C. Bursian, 'Zu Hyginus', *NJPhP* 93 (1866), 761–88; G. F. Unger, 'Der sogenannte Cornelius Nepos', *ABAW* 16.1 (1881), 127–216; F. Leo, *Gr.-röm. Biographie* (1901), 138; G. Wissowa, *Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion und Stadtsgeschichte* (Munich, 1904), 234; A. Klotz, 'Zur Litteratur der exempla und zur Epitoma Liuii', *Hermes* 44 (1909), 198–214; A. Diehl, 'C. Iulius (278) Hyginus', *RE* 10 (1917), 628–36; Cichorius, *RS* (1922), 293–4; C. Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus* (Stuttgart, 1929), 51–7; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 368–72; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 92, 102–3, 106–7, 122–3; A. Sacconi, 'Giulio Igino scrittore di biografie', *RCCM* 3 (1961), 246–9; J. Poucet, 'Les Origines mythiques des Sabins', in *Etudes étrusco-italiques: Mélanges pour le 25[e] anniversaire de la chaire d'étruscologie à l'université de Louvain* (Louvain, 1963), 155–225, esp. 203–13; L. Petersen, *PIR*[2] I (1966), 357; K. G. Sallmann, *Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro* (Berlin, New York, 1971), 35–7; P. L. Schmidt, '(Aurelius) Victor. III. Viri illustres', *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1641–55; L. Duret, 'Dans l'ombre des plus grands 1: poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l'époque augustéenne', *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1447–1560, at 1539–43; J. Geiger, 'Cornelius Nepos and the authorship of the book on foreign generals', *ICM* 7 (1982), 134–6; P. Toohey, 'Politics, prejudice and Trojan genealogies: Varro, Hyginus, and Horace', *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 5–28; R. A. Kaster, *Suetonius de grammaticis et rhetoribus* (Oxford, 1995), 204–14; P. L. Schmidt, 'Hyginus', *DNP* 5 (1998), 778–9; id., 'Die *libri de uiris illustribus*: zu Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption einer Gattung der römischen Historiographie', in M. Coudry, T. Späth (eds.), *L'Invention des grandes hommes de la Rome antique* (Paris, 2001), 173–87.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Suetonius offers a life of Gaius Julius Hyginus (T3),[1] whose *praenomen* and *nomen* confirm what Suetonius says of his status as a freed slave of Augustus. Suetonius gives two rival accounts of his origins. The association with the Milesian Alexander Polyhistor might appear to make an Alexandrian origin the more likely of the two, but it would be hard to understand how the alternative, that he was Spanish, could have

[1] This man and others of the same *cognomen* are conveniently distinguished in a series of articles in *OCD*[4] 714–15, and by Petersen in *PIR*[2]. His full name (including *praenomen*) is given in T3 and T4; see Funaioli, *GRF* 525 and Diehl, *RE* 10. 628; The transmitted reading *L. Hyginus* in F1 is clearly an error, and was corrected to *I<ulius> Hyginus* by Popma (see *apparatus*). Cichorius (*RS* 293–4) saw a reference to him in an inscription from Rome (*CIL* 6.10395=1[2] p. 69: records of a burial society associated with the imperial house, with a C. Iulius Hyl . . . | mentioned as an official in 2 BC), but he did not convince Petersen.

developed if there were no basis for it.[2] The capture of Alexandria, which Suetonius mentions as the occasion for his removal to Rome, took place in 47 BC; hence in Peter's view he was born in the period 64–60. Jerome, calling him by the name of his mentor Polyhistor (no doubt as a result of careless reading of Suetonius: cf. Kaster ad loc.), offers 9 BC as his *floruit* (T5). His charge of the Palatine Library cannot have begun before 28, when Augustus founded it. His friend Ovid lived from 42 BC to *c.* AD 17, and the historian Clodius Licinus (no. 64), also a close friend, held the consulship in AD 4. The uncertain argument based on the view that Ovid *trist.* 3.14 is addressed to him has led to the conclusion that he was still in charge of the library in AD 10;[3] but Clodius Licinus' reported statement (64 F4) that he was impoverished in old age and dependent on his (Clodius') charity suggests the opposite, namely that Hyginus was no longer head of the library in AD 10, and consequently that the poem is addressed not to him but to a successor.[4] Hyginus' freedman Modestus wrote on *feriae* and on various orthographical, literary, and etymological topics.[5]

Works

Hyginus' output was remarkable, especially for a freedman (he is in the same league as the senator Varro), and something must be credited to the example of his teacher Polyhistor, who probably included an *Italica* in his output.[6] Given the number of authors called Hyginus,[7] how can we be sure that any work under this name was written by Augustus' freedman? There could be danger of circularity, of attributing works on the basis of preconceptions about what a particular Hyginus might have written. However, the attested date of C. Julius Hyginus offers some help in guaranteeing the agricultural work referred to by Columella (1.1.13); then his work on famous men is alluded to by Asconius (F1), who antedates the other writers called Hyginus. Again, what is known of their special interests does not overlap much with

[2] Peter (2. cii) accepts the circumstantial story of Alexandrian origin, but Cichorius (*RS* 295) inclines to Spain; so too Kaster, ad loc. Diehl, *RE* 10. 629, followed by Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 368, suggests either that Hyginus was removed from Spain to Alexandria very early in life or that his style and adherence to Polyhistor gave rise to the story of his birth in Alexandria.

[3] Peter 2. ciii, citing earlier literature. For the problem of accommodating all the data on Hyginus' life, see Funaioli, *GRF* 526 and Diehl, *RE* 10. 628.

[4] Kaster, comm. ad loc., with full discussion.

[5] *PIR*[2] I 432; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 150. *feriae*: Macr. *sat.* 1.44.7; 1.10.9; 16.28; Gell. 3.9.1; other topics: Quint. *inst.* 1.6.36; Charisius 92, 95, 128, 132, 159, 265; Diomedes *GL* 1, 365; Bede, *hist. eccl.* 7.277.20.

[6] Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 26.

[7] Two works on field boundaries by (probably) two different authors, both named Hyginus, are included in the *Corpus Agrimensorum*: B. Campbell, *The Writings of the Roman Land Surveyors* (London, 2000), 76–101 (Hyginus 1), and 134–63 (Hyginus 2 'Gromaticus'). On the question of authorship see Campbell's introduction, xxxv–xxxvii; also in *JRS* 86 (1996), 77–8. He dates Hyginus 1 to *c.* AD 100, and Hyginus 2 'no later than the second or third century AD'. One manuscript (P) identifies Hyginus 2 with 'Hyginus the freedman of Augustus'; but this can be absolutely excluded because the text includes a quotation from Lucan, at T151.18–19. A work on the fortification of camps is preserved in a manuscript along with some other texts attributed to Hyginus 2; but it is generally agreed this work, conventionally called *De munitionibus castrorum*, was not written by either Hyginus 1 or Hyginus 2. See M. Lenoir, *Pseudo-Hygin, Des fortifications du camp* (Paris, 1979): authorship and date (Trajanic?) are discussed at vii–viii and 111–33; cf. Campbell, *JRS* 86 (1996), 78 n. 16; *Writings*, xxxvi n. 102. On Hyginus the author of the extant *Genealogiae* and *De astronomia* see below, and n. 15.

our author's publications, wide-ranging though they were. Finally, Columella (loc. cit.), Gellius (F2–3), and Macrobius (F5) use the full *nomen* and *cognomen* and offer no hint of a need to distinguish between several writers.

Suetonius says nothing explicit about the works, but the book from which the information on Hyginus' life is derived is on *grammatici* and rhetors (T3); unlike his friend Clodius Licinus (no. 64), Hyginus was known not as a historian (*historicus*) but as an expert in language and literature (*grammaticus*).[8] Peter notes that in the six citations of Hyginus that Pliny offers in *nat.* 1, in which the name of the book is not specified, there is no trace of historical work: they are related to natural history and seem to be derived from a *de agricultura*; he adduces the closeness to Hyginus of Tremellius Scrofa and the Sasernae in the indexes of books 10, 11, and 17, but allows that some of his 'Italic' material may have passed into book 3, such as Alexander Polyhistor's view (3.124) on the origin of the Orumbouii (cf. Cato 5 F57 and comm.).[9]

The Augustan Hyginus was a polymath who is credited not only with works on literature (a commentary on Virgil,[10] and on C. Helvius Cinna's *Propempticon*[11]) and treatises on farming,[12] including one on bees,[13] but also with historical or antiquarian works and treatises on religion (he was learned in pontifical law and wrote *de proprietatibus deorum* and *de dis penatibus*).[14] Whether the extant works on mythical genealogies (the so-called *Fabulae*, but probably originally called *Genealogiae*) and astronomy (the so-called *De astronomia*) are to be attributed to our Hyginus is disputed.[15] The classification of Schanz–Hosius distinguishes 'landwirtschaftliche Schriften'; 'philologische Kommentare'; 'historischen und geographischen Werke';

[8] T4–5; also Gell. 5.8 *cap.*

[9] Peter 2. cvii. A. Klotz, *Quaestiones Plinianae geographicae* (Berlin, 1906), 8, suggests that Pliny continued his list of sources for the geographical works without striking out those that were no longer relevant; so too D. Detlefsen, *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius* (Berlin, 1909), 36. Sallmann, *Geographie* (1971), 36 n. 4, argues that Pliny had not read Hyginus, but simply included him as a writer likely to include relevant material.

[10] Gell. 1.21.1, cf. 7.6.2; 10.16 (*cap.: quos errores Iulius Hyginus in sexto Vergilii animadvertit in Romana historia erratos*); 16.6.14; see Funaioli, *GRF* 528–33, with discussion 528. Hyginus seems to have been concerned mainly with matters of antiquarian and historical interest, dealing with the meaning of technical terms (Funaioli F3, F5, F6, F11), correcting what he saw as historical errors and anachronisms (Funaioli F7, F9), and arguing, from the contradiction between Virgil and Hesiod (*Theog.* 1011), that there was more than one Latinus (Funaioli F10).

[11] Charis. 171. For an assessment of Hyginus' commentaries, see J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York, 1981), 31–6; S. Timpanaro, *Per la storia della filologia virgiliana antica* (Rome, 1986), 51–67; Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 210–11.

[12] Col. *de agr.* 1.1.13 (Diehl, surely misconstruing *eius*, thought that Hyginus was Virgil's *paedagogus* and that his work was consulted by Virgil: on this see Kaster, *Suetonius*, 206); 3.11.8; 11.2.83; 11.3.62; Charis. 180.

[13] Col. *de agric.* 9.13.8; also cited at 9.2.1–2 (=T1); 9.11.5; 9.13.3, 6; 9.14.1. Bursian, *NJPhP* 93 (1866), 768 n. 14, doubts whether the work on bees was a separate treatise; although Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 106–7, points out that bees, linguistically speaking, should not form part of a treatise on *agricultura*, Virgil found a place for them in his *Georgics*.

[14] Macr. *sat.* 3.4.13 (*de dis penatibus*); 3.8.4 (*de proprietatibus deorum*); cf. Gell. 16.6.14.

[15] Cross references in the *De astronomia* to the *Genealogiae* show that both works are by the same author, who is identified with the freedman of Augustus by A. le Boeuffle, *REL* 43 (1965), 287–8; id., *Hygin: l'Astronomie* (Paris, 1983), xxxi–xxxviii; Duret, *ANRW* 2.30.3, 1540–3; G. Virè, *Hyginus de astronomia* (Leipzig, 1992), iii; Schmidt, *DNP* 5, 779. The identification is rejected by P. K. Marshall, *Hygini Fabulae* (Leipzig, 1993), ix n. 9, and Kaster, *Suetonius*, 208, who return to the traditional view (e.g. Schanz–Hosius 2[4], 378) that they are by a different Hyginus, dated by Kaster to the second century AD. Cf. I. Appendix 1, A20.

and 'antiquarische Schriften'; they regard the works *de proprietatibus deorum* and *de dis penatibus* as purely antiquarian. Hyginus' diligence and erudition are praised by Columella (T1), admittedly on the subject of beehives, but it is likely enough that these qualities characterized all of his output.

The works that appear to have had some historical content and to deserve consideration here are the following: 1. *De uiris illustribus*, in at least six books (F2, but cf. below, and comm. on F1); 2. *De urbibus Italicis*; 3. *De familiis Troianis*; 4. *Exempla*.

1. *De uiris illustribus*. Jerome (T6), deriving from Suetonius, includes Hyginus in a list of writers *de uiris illustribus* that comprises [M. Terentius] Varro, Santra, [Cornelius] Nepos, and [C. Suetonius] Tranquillus—a wide range. Peter regards Hyginus as a follower of Nepos rather than Varro. The title is general, and Gellius calls the work *De uita rebusque inlustrium uirorum*. F2 and F3–4 show that Hyginus followed the example of Nepos, who, according to Hellenistic precedent which assigned generals and statesmen to historiography, wrote on literary and cultural figures but finally added military and political ones as well;[16] that Hyginus also dealt with literary and cultural figures as well as political and military ones is likely enough, given that Jerome's list (T6) is strictly concerned with literary biographers,[17] but which category attracted his main focus is unclear. It is also uncertain whether he included Greeks as well as Romans (cf. below, and n. 26).

In this connection it is necessary to mention the radical theories of G. F. Unger, who in 1882 argued that Hyginus was the author of the work 'On Outstanding Generals of Foreign Nations' (*De excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium*) that has traditionally been ascribed to Cornelius Nepos. This speculative hypothesis was heavily criticized and soon forgotten, but it was revived in 1978 by P. L. Schmidt, and has been reiterated and developed by him in subsequent publications.[18] It is true that Nepos' authorship of the book on foreign generals is based on inference rather than manuscript attribution,[19] but the case for Nepos is nevertheless strong, while the counter-arguments of Unger and Schmidt amount to very little.[20] As for Hyginus, the only reason for regarding him as the author is that he lived at the right time and

[16] Cf. Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 229–30, citing A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 65–100. She regards Hellenistic biography as work of a scholarly rather than a political type: 'it most typically issued in strings of brief lives of poets, philosophers, and scholars . . . Such biography was written not for statesmen and generals, but for what the Romans called *curiosi*.' Similarly Leo, *Gr.-röm. Biographie*, 131–2: 'er erscheint durchaus also Grammatiker varronisches Gepräges.' The view that political biography did not exist as an established literary category among the Greeks (as opposed to *encomia* or historical works centred on great men), and that it was invented *ex nihilo* by Cornelius Nepos, has been vigorously asserted by Joseph Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 30–65 (Hellenistic biography); 66–115 (Nepos); 116 (summary). For a judicious assessment of this issue, with partial acceptance of Geiger's arguments, see C. J. Tuplin, *SLLRH* 10 (2000), 124–61.

[17] The point is rightly emphasized by Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 34; Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 31.

[18] Unger, *ABAW* 16.1 (1881), 127–216; Schmidt, *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1641–55; id., in Herzog–Schmidt 5 (1989), 188; id., in Coudry, Späth (eds.), *L'Invention des grandes hommes* (2001), 173–87. Schmidt has been followed by his pupil J. Fugmann, *Königszeit und frühe Republik in der Schrift 'De viris illustribus'* 1 (Frankfurt, 1990), 52–67, 319–20; 2.1 (Frankfurt, 2000), 96, 210; 2.2 (Frankfurt 2004), 11; id., *MH* 57 (2000), 141–4.

[19] Everyone agrees that the attribution in some MSS to the fifth-century grammarian Aemilius Probus is based on a misunderstanding of the subscription epigram.

[20] For a robust defence of the traditional view, against Unger and Schmidt, see Geiger, *LCM* 2 (1982), 134–6.

is known to have written lives of *uiri illustres*;[21] he is therefore available as a possible alternative if Nepos is ruled out. But there is no positive evidence to connect him with the book on foreign generals.

The same applies to Unger's wider argument about the influence of Hyginus, who he claims was the ultimate source of the so-called *De uiris illustribus* and of parallel passages in the historical sections of Ampelius' *Liber memorialis*. Schmidt goes further, and adds the *elogia* of the Forum of Augustus (Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* 13.3, *Elogia*), which have often been compared to the *De uiris illustribus* and which it would not be unreasonable to connect with Hyginus, the Palatine librarian and one of the emperor's leading antiquarian scholars.[22] There are two problems here. In the first place it is not at all clear that these texts share a single common source (although there is certainly a close connection between Ampelius and the *De uiris illustribus*), nor that their source(s) included a collection of biographies;[23] and in the second place there is no positive evidence to connect any of them specifically with Hyginus.[24] The only point at which the *De uiris illustribus* coincides with Hyginus is in the fragments dealing with the Scipionic legend (F3–4): but the legend was well established in the tradition, and there is no reason to think that the *de uir. ill.* depends here on Hyginus rather than on some other source (see comm. ad loc.). The idea that Ampelius used Hyginus seems to be quite unfounded.

Gellius (F2) quotes from the sixth book of *De uita rebusque inlustrium uirorum*, while Asconius (F1) refers to the first book of *de claris uiris*. The problem here is that Asconius writes *in priore libro* (rather than *in primo libro*), which must imply only two books in all. Possible solutions include the idea of two separate works, the shorter of which may have been an epitome of the longer, or an error in Asconius.[25] But on this

[21] The dedication to Atticus, who died in 32 BC, would make it a relatively youthful work of Hyginus if he was born in *c.*60. In his 1978 article (*RE* Suppl. 15. 1642–3) Schmidt accepted Unger's view that the Atticus in question was not Cicero's friend but a later man of the same name; but he has since recanted (in Coudry, Späth (eds.), *L'Invention des grandes hommes* (2001), 183 n. 22). Internal indications in any case suggest independently that the work belongs to the triumviral period rather than to the reign of Augustus: A. C. Dionisotti, *JRS* 78 (1988), 35–49.

[22] The *possibility* that Hyginus had some role in the composition of the *elogia* is not unreasonable. That does not, however, make his involvement certain or even probable. Even if it were certain it would not follow that Hyginus was the source (or even *a* source) of Ampelius and the *De uiris illustribus*. A close link between the *elogia* and the *De uiris illustribus* is urged by some (e.g. Schanz–Hosius 4.1[2] (1914), 71–2), while L. Braccesi has argued that the *elogia* themselves were the direct source of the *de uir. ill.* (*Introduzione al de viris illustribus* (Bologna, 1973), 1–31, with further bibliography); but others are far from convinced, most recently M. Sage, *Historia* 28 (1979), 192–210; 32 (1983), 250–6.

[23] An important paradox pointed out e.g. by M. Sage (*TAPhA* 108 (1978), 217–48) is that much of the *De uiris illustribus* is not, in fact, biographical in structure, but rather a historical narrative organized around great men.

[24] Schmidt's statement (*RE* Suppl. 15. 1644), 'Die erhaltenen Fragmente aus Hygins Biographiensammlung bleiben exakt in dem durch die Elogien, Ampelius und *uir. ill.* abgesteckten Personenkreis', is thoroughly misleading. Even if it means no more than that the persons who feature in the fragments are also dealt with by the *elogia*, Ampelius, and *uir. ill.*, it is still misleading: only the *elogia* and Hyginus (F1) distinguish between P. Valerius Publicola (called Lucius Valerius by *uir. ill.* 15.1) and M'. Valerius Maximus (called M. Valerius in the Hyginus fragment). Fabricius Luscinus (F2) is mentioned by Ampelius (18.9) and *uir. ill.* (35.6–8), but as censor and as a commander in the Pyrrhic War; there is no trace of the story told in Hyginus F2. As for the Scipionic legend, it appears in Hyginus F3–4 and in *uir. ill.* (49.1–2), but not in Ampelius. On the sources for this story see comm. ad loc.

[25] Two separate works: Leo, *Gr.-röm. Biogr.*, 138; Kaster, *Suetonius*, 207. Epitome: Peter 2. cv; Diehl, *RE* 10. 632–3; Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 370. Error in Asconius: Sacconi, *RCCM* 3 (1961), 248–9.

point there is merit in Unger's suggestion (followed by Schmidt) that *de claris uiris* was the title of a subsection, dealing with Roman generals and statesmen, of a larger work *De uita rebusque inlustrium uirorum*, which would have included sections on other categories of *uiri illustres*.[26] This is an attractive idea in principle, and does not entail acceptance of any of the more speculative reconstructions proposed by Unger and Schmidt.[27]

2. *De urbibus Italicis*. This work, in at least two books (F5), is variously referred to:[28] *de situ urbium Italicarum* (F6; *de situ urbis* in F11 may be an echo of the title); *Italicae urbes* (F7–8); *de origine urbium Italicarum* (F9). From this Schanz–Hosius infer that the full title was *De origine et situ urbium Italicarum*; we may compare Tacitus' *De Germanorum origine et situ* and Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae et totius mundi origines et terrae situs*. T7 clearly implies that Hyginus, unlike Pliny and Ptolemy, limited his enquiry to Italy.[29] It has nevertheless been argued[30] that the volume on Italy was only part of a larger work covering several countries, but Peter (2. cvi) was probably right to reject this. If the title included the phrase *de situ*, the work might theoretically have been purely geographical, but this seems unlikely: Servius' account of it (T7) puts it alongside Cato's *Origines* (note also the titles of Tacitus and Trogus, cited above, and cf. n. 31). The fragments show both topographical and historical or antiquarian features, and the variants of the title that survive suggest that it comprised both topographical and historical elements.[31] In the surviving fragments the historical element is largely confined to origins,[32] but what survives may not be representative. It is also quite uncertain whether Hyginus attempted to place his study of Italian cities within a broader historical framework or narrative structure in the manner of Cato or Trogus, or of those early Roman historians who included discussion of Italian origins

[26] Most obviously, one might think, categories such as poets, orators, and grammarians, in the manner of Nepos and Suetonius, as Jerome implies (T6: see I. 477 and n. 16). Unger and Schmidt, however, believe, against the evidence of Jerome, that Hyginus was concerned only with history and historical biography (the only literary figures being historians, a conclusion that is forced on them by Nepos [=Hyginus], *Dion* 3.2); they also argue that he alone included lives of foreign generals, kings, etc., comparing Roman and non-Roman examples (Schmidt, *RE* Suppl. 15. 1642).

[27] Schmidt offers an elaborate and highly speculative reconstruction of Hyginus' work, which he thinks comprised nine books, as follows: 1. Greek historians; 2. Roman historians; 3. Greek kings; 4. Roman kings; 5. Foreign generals; 6–7. Roman generals; 8. Political leaders; 9. Enemies of Rome. See *RE* Suppl. 15. 1646; and in Coudry, Späth (eds.), *L'Invention des grandes hommes* (2001), 181.

[28] This suggested to Diehl, *RE* 10. 634, that those who mention it had not read the book itself.

[29] Thus, rightly, Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 102.

[30] Bursian, *NJPhP* 93 (1866), 768, n. 14; Unger, *ABAW* 16.1 (1882), 211, followed by Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 130 n. 1: they argue that Macrobius and Servius were using a Virgilian commentary interested only in Italian sections; and that Macrobius (F5: *in libro secundo urbium*) could be referring, in view of Pliny's lists (T2), to a work concerned more with general chorography; the other writers listed by Pliny, such as Vetus and Mela, wrote popular works of general geography.

[31] For the combination of physical geography (*situs*) and origins in historical ethnography cf. Oakley, *Comm.* 2. 629. *de situ* in F6 is particularly appropriate for the context, stressing that topography was one of Hyginus' interests. In Bardon's view (*Litt. inconnue*, 2. 103) Hyginus was interested more in the origin than the situation; his procedure was to assign each city its place, then deal with the problems posed by its origins. This seems over-simple: character and situation are interrelated. Schanz–Hosius (2⁴. 372) see the mythical element stressed in this work: they cite Macr. *sat.* 3.8.4 (see n. 14); in F10 the author Protarchus of Tralles is the source; see comm. ad loc.

[32] One distinct feature they seem to show is that of stressing the Greek origin of the peoples and deities of central Italy.

in their works, such as Cassius Hemina (6) and Cn. Gellius (14). Nevertheless the arrangement is more likely to have been systematic and descriptive than narrative and chronological. If so, Hyginus' work on Italian cities might be described as more properly 'antiquarian' than 'historical', but the fragments are so similar in content to those of Cato, Hemina, Gellius, etc. that it seems reasonable to include them here.

We do not know when the work was written, and cannot therefore define with certainty its relationship (if any) with the *Aeneid*, but on balance it is unlikely that Hyginus wrote first or that Virgil was able to make use of his work in the Italian and Etruscan catalogues in *Aeneid* 7 and 10.[33] More probably Hyginus wrote later, but we cannot know if his work on Italian cities was influenced by Virgil, as the *De familiis Troianis* seems to have been (see below), or, if so, how. In any event we are left with the problem of deciding, in the case of unassigned fragments dealing with Italy (F10–13), whether they belong to the work on Italian cities or to the commentary on Virgil (see n. 10). We have included them here as 'probably from *De Italicis urbibus*', but in the knowledge that the commentary is also possible.

3. In writing *De familiis Troianis* (F14), Hyginus seems to have followed the example of Atticus and Varro. Indeed, Varro's work has the same title.[34] Although Toohey dates it to the early 20s,[35] F14 suggests that Hyginus knew at least part of the *Aeneid*, and he may have been prompted to write his treatise by reading it. Whether this may be counted as a historical or antiquarian work, rather than as a literary study, depends on how far down Hyginus traced the families. Diehl plausibly suggests that the work was designed to meet the taste of ambitious Roman families, the new Augustan nobility, a wider circle than Varro had catered for, and Toohey goes further, perhaps too far, arguing that the work is a product of political pressure in favour of new patricians and of latent anti-Greek prejudice.[36]

4. The *Exempla* are known from a single fragment cited by Gellius (10.18.7=Peter F1, Funaioli F12), reporting Hyginus' critical opinion of Theodectes' tragedy *Mausolus*. We may note that Nepos had also written a work called *exempla*, of which a handful of fragments survive (see I. 396–8), and that Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia* may give us an extant example of the genre. Beyond that very little can be said.[37] Klotz nevertheless believed that Hyginus' *Exempla* formed a collection of material, based at least partly on Livy, which has left traces in Seneca, Valerius Maximus, Frontinus, Apuleius (*apol.* 18), and Macrobius (*sat.* 1.11). Thus the Gellius passage is close to Val. Max. 4.6 ext. 1.[38] This is ingenious, though it forms a speculative basis for reconstructing the content of Hyginus' work.[39] Some have

[33] Thus, Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7* (Leiden, 2000), 418.

[34] Serv. *Aen.* 5.704=Varro 52 F3b; see Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 566.

[35] Toohey, *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 8.

[36] Diehl, *RE* 10. 634; Toohey, *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 5–12.

[37] Geiger, *Cornelius Nepos*, 74–5, rightly stresses our ignorance in this context.

[38] Klotz, *Hermes* 44 (1909), 98–214. L. Traube (*Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* (Berlin, 1909), 10) held that the *fragmentum de praenominibus* (printed in *Valerius Maximus*, ed. J. Briscoe (Stuttgart, 1998), 794–9) derived from Hyginus; because Val. Max. 8.13 ext. 7 cites Polyhistor, Traube believed (p. 17) that that passage too came from Hyginus; cf. Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus* (1929), 51. For the attachment of the *fragmentum* to Paris' epitome of Valerius Maximus see Schmidt, *RE* Suppl. 15. 1645–52; Briscoe, op. cit. xx.

[39] Diehl, *RE* 10. 633, allows 'ein indirektes Fortleben der Exempla' as 'nicht unwahrscheinlich'.

identified it with the work on famous men,[40] but although Hellenistic biography could be little more than a framework for a collection of exemplary anecdotes,[41] there is no justification in this case for arbitrarily eliminating Hyginus' *Exempla*, given that other authors, especially Nepos, had produced separate works of this type. As in the case of Nepos, however, we see no reason to treat Hyginus' *Exempla* as a work of history (see I. 398), especially as the one preserved fragment seems to be concerned with literary criticism.

In general, Bardon comments that Hyginus 'se limite étroitement; encore les préoccupations de l'historien se confondent-elles, en lui, avec celles de l'antiquaire'.[42] Hyginus, like Varro and Nepos, blurred modern distinctions between historian and antiquarian. A number of Hyginus' works were historical in nature, without being true histories, and in different ways: the work on Italian cities dealt with origins; the work on famous men could have consisted of brief biographies; the work on Trojan families probably included a great deal of Roman family history too, but elaborated not for its own sake or for the significance of the events in which the families were involved, but to show the distinction and antiquity of their ancestry. Whether the *Exempla* included historical material is unclear (see above).

How long Hyginus' works remained in current use is uncertain.[43] Scholars have thought of a limited period. Noting Hyginus' titles as echoing those of his predecessors, above all Varro and Nepos, and that he is often cited together with earlier authors, especially Varro (see F1, F3, F4, F10, F11, F13), they have argued that lack of originality would have led to his disappearance.[44] Thus Columella credits him with industriously collating the opinions (on beehives) of ancient authors.[45] Peter is sceptical of later writers' claims to have consulted him rather than writers who quoted him. Fragments of the *De urbibus italicis* are known only from Servius and Macrobius, which Peter attributes to their reading of a commentator on Virgil;[46] the different versions of its title may suggest only indirect knowledge of the actual text, but this is hardly conclusive; the variants serve as handy abbreviations. It is less fashionable now than in Peter's day to believe that ancient authors always quoted their predecessors at second hand; and as for originality, the evidence of extant texts hardly encourages the notion that original works have mostly been preserved, while the efforts of compilers, hacks, and epitomators have been lost.

(BML, TJC)

[40] R. G. Lewis, *Asconius, Commentaries* (Oxford, 2006), 208; B. A. Marshall, *A Historical Commentary on Asconius* (Columbia, Mich., 1985), 105. This evidently tralaticious notion seems to have originated with what may be a misprint in *OCD*[3] 533 (C. J. Fordyce).

[41] Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 72–3.

[42] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2. 92.

[43] Hyginus' *De Italicis urbibus* was probably one of the sources for Silius Italicus' Italian catalogue (*Pun.* 8.349–621): B. Rehm, *Philologus* Suppbd. 24.2 (1932), 98–9; G. Firpo, *Athenaeum* 83 (1995), 514–15; Briquel, *Pelasges*, 95–6; and see comm. on F9. For the *De illustribus aris* as a source of Jerome, see Puccioni, *ASNP* 25 (1956), 209. For theories of more extensive influence on late antique historiography, see I. 477–8 and nn. 18, 22, 24.

[44] Diehl, *RE* 10. 629–30: 'mehr fleissiger Kompilator . . . also selbständiger Forscher'; Schanz–Hosius 2[3]. 372.

[45] Col. *de re rust.* 9.2.1 (=T1), and other passages cited by Diehl, *RE* 10. 630.

[46] F5–9; Peter 2. cvi.

64

C. Clodius Licinus

Editions: Peter 2. cvii–cviii, 77–8.

Principal discussions: M. Hertz, *De historicorum Romanorum reliquiis* (Breslau, 1871), 3–9; L. Holzapfel, 'L'opera storica di Clodio Licino', *RSA* 1.2 (1895), 61–7; C. Cichorius, '(C.) Clodius (35) Licinus', *RE* 4 (1900), 77–9; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 329; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 97–8; S. P. Oakley, 'Livy and Clodius Licinus', *CQ* 42 (1992), 547–51.

INTRODUCTION

C. Clodius C. f. C. n. Licinus, the suffect consul of AD 4,[1] must be the 'consular historian' mentioned by Suetonius (T1, F4). We have followed Peter, who accepted most of the arguments of Hertz, in giving Clodius Licinus a separate entry of his own, and assigning four fragments to him.[2] However, before Peter's *editio minor* of 1883 his status had been less secure: Krause and Roth, for example, placed his fragments alongside those of some other Claudii or Clodii who wrote historical or antiquarian works.[3] As for the fragments themselves, F1, whatever doubts one may have about its place in the text of Livy, has always been accepted as a genuine fragment of Clodius Licinus,[4] although Bergk seems to have been the first to link it to Clodius Licinus the consular historian.[5] F2–3 had to work harder for their status. Although Vossius, Weichert, and Giesebrecht had assigned F3 to Clodius Licinus,[6] Krause and Liebaldt preferred Licinius Macer.[7] Popma and Krause had assigned F2 to Quadrigarius,[8] Peter to Servius Clodius Grammaticus;[9] but Giesebrecht (see n. 6), investigating the relationship of various Claudii and Clodii to Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, again rightly championed Clodius' authorship of F2. Hertz (see n. 2) decisively vindicated his authorship of both fragments. His argument rested principally on Nonius' use of *rerum Romanarum*, which coincides precisely with the language used at [Liv.] 29.22.10 (F1). In F3, ascribed to *Licinus* (or *Licinius*) *rerum Romanarum lib. XXI*, Nonius'

[1] See the entries in the *fasti Capitolini* and other *fasti*: *I.I.* 13.1, 61, 257–8, 297, 528. Full details in *PIR*^{2} C1167 (Groag).

[2] Peter, *HRF* 271, following Hertz, *De hist. Rom. rel.* (1871), 3–9, cited by Peter 2. cvii n. 1.

[3] Krause 213–14; Roth 322–3.

[4] It is the only fragment listed by Agustín 29.

[5] T. Bergk, in C. B. Bunte, *De C. Julii Hygini Augusti liberti uita et scriptis: pars prior* (Diss. Marburg, 1846), 9–10.

[6] Vossius, *Hist. Lat.*^{2}, 35; M. A. Weichert, *Commentatio de C. Licinio Calvo* (Grimae, 1825), 5 n. 3; Giesebrecht, *Über Q. Claudius Quadrigarius* (Prenzlau, 1831), 9.

[7] Krause 239; H. Liebaldt, *C. Licinius Macer* (Progr. Naumburg, 1848), 11. This view was thought possible also by Roth (367).

[8] Popma 75; Krause 259.

[9] In the first edition of *HRR* 1 (1870), cccii—a view he retracted in 1883, when editing Clodius Licinus for the first time for *HRF*.

language is quite different from when he quotes Licinius Macer;[10] in F2, ascribed by Nonius to *Claudius rerum Romanarum lib. XII*, Clodius Licinus is far more likely to be meant than any other Clodius.

The nature of Clodius' work is uncertain. Soltau argued that the title *Res Romanae* suggested an antiquarian rather than historical work (one may compare the titles of various works of Varro).[11] This is possible, but Livy used the expression *res Romana(e)* to describe his own subject matter,[12] and *historicus* in F4 (T1) strongly suggests that the work was historical.[13]

From F3 it is evident that the work ran to at least twenty-one books. On the basis of F1 and of the identifications that he suggested for F2 and F3 (on which see below), Holzapfel calculated that Clodius wrote a little more briefly than Livy.[14] F1 shows that book 3 included 194 BC (covered by Livy in book 34), and in Holzapfel's view events of 168 BC occurred in book 12 (equivalent therefore to book 44 of Livy), and of 133 BC in book 21 (the equivalent of Livy book 58); Clodius therefore would have covered in eighteen books what Livy covered in twenty-four. Holzapfel suggested also that a work on this scale would have been compatible with Clodius' beginning in 201, after the Second Punic War: for 201–194 he took a little over two books, Livy a little over three. However, Holzapfel's identifications of the contexts of F2 and F3 are uncertain (see comm.). If F4 is a fragment from the narrative of the *Res Romanae*, then the work will have continued until Clodius' own time; but for difficulties see comm.

(SPO)

[10] Thus Macer 27 F4: *Licinius Macer annali lib. I*; F6: *Licinius Macer annalibus lib. II*.

[11] Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk*, 45.

[12] See e.g. Oakley, *Comm.* 3. 185–6.

[13] Holzapfel (*RSA* 1.2 (1895), 64) referred to Livy. He also cited Titin. *com.* 85: *Ferentinatis populus res Graecas studet* and Nep. *Con.* 5.4: *Dinon historicus, cui nos plurimum de Persicis rebus credimus*, neither of which is very relevant (the passage from Nepos does not give the title of Dinon's work).

[14] *RSA* 1.2 (1895), 65–6.

65

Julius Marathus

Editions: Peter 2. lxxxviii–c, 70–1.

Principal discussions: A. Kappelmacher, 'Julius (337) Marathus', *RE* 10.1 (1917), 669; Petersen, *PIR*² J (1966), 402; Schanz–Hosius, 2⁴ (1935), 328; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 98; Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 461; J. Geiger, 'The Augustan age', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 233–66, at 246–7.

INTRODUCTION

Julius Marathus is one of a set of authors known only from citations in Suetonius' *Life of Augustus*; the others are C. Drusus (66), Julius Saturninus (67), and Aquilius Niger (68).[1] From F1 we learn that Julius Marathus was a freedman of the imperial house, probably of Augustus himself, which gives the only clue to date. The text is corrupt; Lipsius' emendation would give Julius Marathus a secretarial post *a memoria*.[2] Both fragments are complimentary to the emperor: the first recording a prodigy that foretold his future eminence, the second commending his personal appearance.

The combination of personal detail and flattering anecdote may hint at a work of biographical nature (thus Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 98; Gascou, *Suétone historien*, 461), though Baldwin was perhaps too bold when he wrote, 'a dutiful biography of his imperial patron can readily be assumed'.[3] This would associate Julius Marathus, and some of the others quoted by Suetonius, firmly with the trend that Tacitus characterizes as 'the slide into flattery' (*gliscens adulatio*: *ann.* 1.1).[4]

(CJS)

[1] They are grouped together by Schanz–Hosius 1². 328, as 'Schriftsteller über Augustus'.

[2] Accepted by Bardon, Gascou, and J. M. Carter, *Suetonius, Divus Augustus* (Bristol, 1982), ad loc. The post ('in charge of records') is otherwise first attested under Hadrian (*CIL* 6.8618), but that does not mean that it did not exist earlier, or that Suetonius is necessarily guilty of anachronism (cf. G. P. Burton, *JRS* 67 (1977), 162). Lipsius' reading is rejected by G. Müller, *RhM* 124 (1981), 361–2, who suggests *etiam memor* ('also commemorating'; but whether this can mean 'who was also his biographer' is perhaps doubtful).

[3] B. Baldwin, *Suetonius* (Amsterdam, 1983), 143.

[4] The suspicion must be strong that Marathus and his like provided Suetonius with other stories of the same kind, which are unlikely to have appeared in the autobiography. Thus e.g. E. Blumenthal, *WS* 35 (1913), 122; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 98; Gascou, *Suétone historien*, 207, 215, 224.

66

C. Drusus

Editions: Peter 2. c, 71.

Principal discussions: Stein, *PIR*^{2} D (1943),198; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 328; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 98; Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 461–2; J. Geiger, 'The Augustan age', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 233–66, at 247–8.

INTRODUCTION

C. Drusus is unknown beyond a single passage of Suetonius (F1); scholars have been tempted to identify him with either Drusus the son, or Drusus the brother, of the emperor Tiberius, but neither identification seems likely (*contra* Geiger 247). We know from Suetonius *Aug.* 100.3 that Tiberius' son gave a eulogy from the Old Rostra after Augustus' death, but the citation cannot be assigned to this work, which would require Müller's emendation of the text because Tiberius' son did not have the *praenomen* Gaius. Tiberius' brother was Decimus, later Nero, Drusus (Suet. *Claud.* 1.1). Our author is therefore otherwise unknown, but is included because of his association with another author of memoirs, Julius Marathus (no. 65), in Suetonius' life (cf. Gascou, *Suétone historien*, 461–2).

(CJS)

67

Aquilius Niger

Editions: Peter 2. c, 71.

Principal discussions: Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 94; Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 460; J. Geiger, 'The Augustan age', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 233–66, at 249.

INTRODUCTION

Only one fragment is known for Aquilius Niger, and it gives no idea of the title or nature of his work, beyond the clear implication that it contained an account of the battle of Mutina and was therefore probably historical in some sense. Moreover, as it reports a discreditable story we may reasonably assume that it was not wholly favourable to Augustus. This led Peter to speculate that the author was identical with Antony's friend Niger, who according to Plutarch (*Ant.* 53) acted as intermediary between him and Octavia in 35 BC (so too Bardon, who wrongly calls him Antonius Niger). The identification is possible, but hardly compelling.

(CJS)

68

Julius Saturninus

Editions: Peter 2. c, 71.

Principal discussions: F. Münzer, 'Julius (459) Saturninus', *RE* 10 (1917), 798; Petersen, *PIR*^{2} J (1966), 545; Schanz–Hosius, 2^4 (1935), 328; J. Gascou, *Suétone historien* (1984), 460–1; J. Geiger, 'The Augustan age', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 233–66, at 248–9.

INTRODUCTION

Julius Saturninus is one of the sources (along with Julius Marathus (65), Aquilius Niger (66), and C. Drusus (67)) known only from quotations in Suetonius, and it is a matter of conjecture whether his work was a history or biography, or whether it was e.g. a pamphlet (Gascou, *Suétone historien*, 461). Münzer suggested that he was a senator, on the grounds that the information in F1 must have come from someone who had attended the senatorial debate to which it refers.

(CJS)

69

Alfius

Editions: Peter 1^2. ccclxxix–ccclxxx, 316–17.

Discussions: E. Klebs, 'Alfius (1)', *RE* 1 (1894), 1475; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 202; Cichorius, *RS* (1922), 58–67; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 102; J. Heurgon, 'Apollon chez les Mamertins', *MEFR* 68 (1956), 63–81 = *Trois études sur le 'ver sacrum'* (Brussels, 1957), 20–35; E. Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines* (Oxford, 1995), 55–6, 185–6, 211–12.

INTRODUCTION

Cichorius identified the author cited in F1 with Alfius Flavus, the rhetor who, according to the elder Seneca, wasted his natural talent on indolence and poetry.[1] In addition he considered him the same person as the Flavius Alfius who is quoted by Pliny (*nat.* 9.25), together with Maecenas, as a source for a story about a dolphin who fell in love with a boy (see I. Appendix 1, A28). In view of the work's title, *Bellum Carthaginiense* (F1), Cichorius completed the picture by identifying Alfius with the unnamed poet mentioned in Ovid *Pont.* 4.16.23, simply described as *quique acies Libycas Romanaque proelia dixit* ('he who sang of Libyan armies and Roman battles'). Unfortunately, this is all very speculative, and, as Wissowa pointed out in reviewing Cichorius' work (*GGA* 186 (1924), 52), it would be extraordinary if Verrius Flaccus or Festus reduced a long extract from an epic poem to a prose summary.[2]

All we can legitimately say, therefore, about this author is that his name appears to be Oscan (a Marius Alfius is recorded as a Campanian *medix tuticus* in 215 BC: Livy 23.35.13, 19), that his work contained more than one book, and that he must pre-date Verrius Flaccus' compilation, which is of Augustan date. Attempts to date him more precisely range from the third century BC[3] through the Gracchan age[4] to the time of Augustus.[5] We prefer to leave the question open, and have placed him here only because he is earlier than Verrius. On the content of the fragment see commentary.

(CJS, TJC)

[1] Sen. *contr.* 1.1.22–3; cf. 1.7.7; 2.2.3; 2.6.8; 3.7. Another man of the same name, C. Alfius Flavus, perhaps a direct ancestor, was tribune of the plebs in 59 BC and praetor in 54 (*MRR sub annis*), but is not known to have had any literary interests.

[2] Heurgon, however, accepted Cichorius' view that Alfius was a poet (*Trois études* (1957), 25 and n. 2). So too G. Tagliamonte, *I figli di Marte* (Rome, 1994), 192; A. Pinzone, *Provincia Sicilia* (Catania, 1999), 127 and n. 17.

[3] Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men* (1995), 211: 'the late third or early second century BC.' In our view it would be unwise to deduce from the title, referring to a single *bellum Carthaginiense*, that the work was written before 218 BC.

[4] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 102; cf. Klebs, *RE* 1. 1475: 'wahrscheinlich aus vorsullanischer Zeit'.

[5] This, the majority view, is adopted by those who accept Cichorius' identification of Alfius with the Augustan rhetor Alfius Flavus (thus e.g. Salmon, *Samnites*, 124 and n. 4; and the authors cited in n. 2).

70

Fenestella

Editions: Peter 2. cviiii–cxiii, 79–87; P. Accornero, 'Fenestella. I. La vita e l'opera. II. I frammenti', *AAT* 112 (1978), 43–88; A. Mazzarino, *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesareae*, vol. 1 (Turin, 1955), 29–36 (fragments dealing with language).

Principal discussions: L. Mercklin, *De Fenestella historico et poeta* (Dorpat, 1844); L. Mercklin, 'Fenestella', *Philologus* 3 (1848), 151–2; J. Poeth, *De Fenestella historiarum scriptore et carminum* (Bonn, 1849); Peter, *Gesch. Lit.* 1 (1897), 113–14; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 343–7, 382–4; R. Reitzenstein, 'Ein verkanntes Werk Fenestellas', *Festschrift J. Vahlen* (Berlin, 1900), 411–24; G. Wissowa, 'Fenestella', *RE* 6 (1909), 2177–9; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 595–6; Stein, *PIR*[2] 3 (1943), 124 F144; G. Delvaux, *Les Sources de Plutarque dans les Vies parallèles des Romains* (diss. Brussels, 1945) (*non uidimus*); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 147–8; Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1 (1966), 384–9; B. A. Marshall, 'Asconius and Fenestella', *RhM* 123 (1980), 349–54; L. Duret, 'Dans l'ombre des plus grands', *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1447–1560, esp. 1496–1501; Syme, 'Some unrecognized authors from Spain', *RP* 6 (1988), 466–8; G. Delvaux, 'Retour aux sources de Plutarque', *LEC* 56 (1988), 27–48; G. Delvaux, 'L'Annaliste Fénestella et Plutarque', *LEC* 57 (1989), 127–146; G. Delvaux, 'Des proches parents: Plutarque et le *De Viris Ill. u.R.* (pseudo-Aurélius Victor)', *LEC* 61 (1993), 13–23, 115–130.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Fenestella's origins and dates are uncertain. The rarity of his *cognomen* explains why his *nomen* is never recorded but whether it is a Latin derivative of *fenestra*[1] or Etruscan,[2] it offers no clue to Fenestella's own background. If he was buried at Cumae (T5), he presumably owned property there late in his life: that together with a supposed interest in Sibyls (F19) and the termination of Campanian place names such as Abella have suggested that this was his *origo*,[3] but the supporting evidence is weak. Other occurrences of the name among local worthies (in part admittedly uncertain) might point to Spain,[4] and T3 (cf. F16) shows Fenestella supposedly well acquainted with a woman who had attended on the young M. Crassus in Baetica. Other, tantalizing evidence raises the possibility of a still closer connection with Crassus'

[1] I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki, 1965), 347; cf. explanations, probably going back to Varro, of the Porta Fenestella at Rome: Ovid *fast.* 6.577–8; Plut. *mor.* 273B–C; 322E.

[2] W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904), 356, 417–18; B. A. Terracini, *SE* 3 (1929), 223–7; cf. *CIL* 11.2144 (Clusium); Walde–Hofmann 1. 478 s.v. *fenestra*.

[3] L. Mercklin, *De Fenestella* (1844), 2; cf. Accornero, 52; *CIL* 4 Suppl. 2.6035b (an L.Oct(avius) Fene<stella?> on a Pompeian amphora).

[4] Cf. Syme, *RP* 6. 466–8; *RPC* 1. 309 (Caesaraugusta)=L. Curchin, *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain* (Toronto, 1990), 188 n. 472; *RPC* 1. 410 (Turiaso)=Curchin 229 n. 933; J. Corell, *Epigraphica* 56 (1994), 59–67.

family.[5] A M. Crassus Fenestella, an Augustan veteran of the 19th legion, appears on a tombstone from Forum Julii (*CIL* XII.259=*ILN Fréjus* 18), perhaps the 'Fenestela' who owned a plate found at the Roman camp at Haltern.[6] Here Crassus is apparently used as a *nomen*, a phenomenon said to be found predominantly in the provinces and often among legionaries,[7] but given the extreme rarity of the name Fenestella, it is tempting, though speculative, to suppose some connection between the legionary and the historian, perhaps belonging to a provincial family that owed its enfranchisement to the Licinii Crassi. F24 may imply that Fenestella was familiar with the capital from his childhood, but he seems to have made little mark there: no significant political or military experience, no prowess in declamation or even the teaching of grammar or rhetoric is recorded.

F26 was probably written under Tiberius, and the inclusion of Suellius or Suillius among the significant names in F6 may even imply that he started composing his historical work no earlier than the last years of Augustus (cf. comm.). Indeed, if Pliny is correct in dating his death to the mid-30s AD (T2), he may have written it entirely under Tiberius. The problem is complicated, however, by the conflicting evidence of Jerome that he died in AD 19 (T5). This could normally be discounted in view of Jerome's known unreliability[8] and the fact that Pliny was already in Rome in AD 35 and 36 (*nat.* 37.81; cf. 15.47; W. Kroll, *RE* 21. 272–3), around the time that on his account Fenestella died. However, Fenestella's supposed encounter with Paciaecus' (former) slave (T3) is much more easily accommodated on Jerome's chronology. *If* this story is not an *anilis fabula* ('old woman's tale'),[9] she can have been born no later than the mid-90s BC, whereas Pliny's chronology, combined with Jerome's age at death (itself at best probably an approximation), means that Fenestella was born in the mid-30s at the earliest. That does not entirely exclude the encounter but it makes it problematic.

Works

Of Fenestella's poetry (T5) no trace remains (unless in F32), but there is no reason to doubt the implication that he had literary pretensions. Four fragments only are clearly ascribed to the *Annales* (F1–4). The diversity of subject matter of the remainder and the fact that many would aptly grace antiquarian or grammatical writing raises the possibility that Fenestella wrote other, unattested works to which some of these fragments in fact belong: so Reitzenstein supposed that Fenestella wrote separate works on *luxuria* and on Cicero,[10] whilst A. Mazzarino attributes F6–7, 10–11, 18, 21,

[5] For Crassus' descendants see Syme, *AA* 270–83; note the longevity of his daughter-in-law, Caecilia Metella (Syme, *RP* 6. 468 n. 52).

[6] B. Galsterer, *Die Graffiti auf der römischen Gefässkeramik aus Haltern* (Münster, 1983), 30–2, 48 (n. 114).

[7] W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904), 293–4 (comparing e.g. M. Crassus P.f. at Verona (*CIL* 5.3552)); H. Solin in Y. le Bohec (ed.), *Mélanges M. le Glay* (Brussels, 1994), 316.

[8] Cf. R. Helm, *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik* (Leipzig, 1929), esp. 72–3, 93–4; for an adventurous explanation of Jerome's presumed error see Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 345 n. 2.

[9] Cf. A. M. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic* (Columbia, Miss., 1977), 59–60.

[10] *Festschr. Vahlen* (1900), 411–24.

23, 27–8 to one or more works on language.[11] No compelling positive argument has been adduced in their support, but such possibilities cannot be excluded:[12] our information on such matters is incomplete and often casual. We therefore present here separately the fragments not explicitly assigned to a specific work (F5–30).

Nonetheless, many of these fragments most obviously belong to a work of history and, given the diverse conceptions of historical writing in this period and earlier,[13] it can reasonably be supposed that they all do. Earlier annalists, such as Piso, show a marked interest both in topics that fell outside the range of political and military history (including specific details on the development of *luxuria* at Rome: cf. esp. Piso 9 F36) and in material and methods of argument that are also commonly encountered in antiquarian writing. Indeed, in two such instances (F5, F10), Fenestella's account could already be found in Macer and Sisenna respectively. As Mercklin observed, Pliny in the *Natural History* cites unnamed *annales* for items comparable to those fragments of Fenestella that appear least compatible with a conventional work of history (e.g. F24–7).[14] In other instances Fenestella's material is either itself incorporated into a chronological narrative or can be paralleled in other such narratives (F6, F8, F15). The following discussion therefore attempts to estimate the character of Fenestella's work on the hypothesis that F5–30 all come from the *Annales*.

Fenestella is often dismissed as a pedant consumed by a preoccupation with antiquarian detail for its own sake, or an encyclopedist devoid of any sense of what was historically significant.[15] Such judgements depend in part on implicit assumptions of what 'model history' should be and on misreading the evidence of Sen. *epist.* 108.30–1 and *dial.* 10.13.6 (see comm. on F8, F15), but they also ignore the fact that he is seldom cited by later historians (with the result that we have no more than tantalizing hints of his handling of major political and military events) and that the interests of the sources that do cite him mean that our fragments are slanted towards other material (e.g. developments in dress and dining) in a way, and on a scale, that is most unlikely to reflect the overall economy of the work.

Reconstruction of Fenestella's *Annales* must therefore be peculiarly tentative. F2 shows that it had reached book 22 by late 57 BC and the fragments suggest a detailed narrative from at least the mid-second century (F11–13; cf. F4). Madvig supposed that it only began with the close of the Second Punic War,[16] but F5, F7 (see comm.), and F8 in particular are perhaps more likely to have appeared in a consecutive narrative of the early period than in retrospective digressions. The interpretation here offered of F1 would further support this (cf. also F9 with comm.), although other possibilities (such as a synchronic rather than diachronic account of Rome's early development) cannot be excluded. If F24–6 derive from the *Annales*, they show that Fenestella incorporated at least some discussion of developments in dining furniture, jewellery, and dress into the (late) Augustan period, and his narrative may well

[11] *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesareae* 1 (Turin, 1955), 29–36.

[12] Cf. Wissowa, *RE* 6. 2179.

[13] Cf. J. Marincola in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography* (Leiden, etc., 1999), esp. 306–9.

[14] Mercklin, *De Fenestella* (1844), 10; cf. also Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 211–15; Peter 2. cx n. 1.

[15] So e.g. Peter 2. cx–cxi; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 147–8; Accornero 55–60.

[16] J. N. Madvig (*De Q. Asconi Pediani et aliorum veterum interpretum in Ciceronis orationes commentariis disputatio critica* (Copenhagen, 1828), 64 n. 2.

have extended that far, but largely thanks to Asconius the fragments bearing directly on political matters refer to an earlier period.

Given the overall scale of the work Fenestella cannot have dealt with the early period at great length, nor would there have been much benefit in revisiting territory that Livy had covered extensively. However, the fragments suggest that he may have significantly varied the Livian narrative in detail: he supplied a discussion of the origins of the quaestorship that Livy conspicuously omitted (F7), gave a different account of the history of the calendar (F5), and noted details about the early economy that Livy had ignored (F6, F9). The same need to establish a distinctive historiographical identity must have conditioned Fenestella's later narrative also, but much of his account of political and military events may have been conventional in approach. It was clearly organized diachronically, and political events were probably treated in some detail (cf. F2 with comm.), but only one fragment (F30) can plausibly (though not certainly) be associated with external warfare. That may reflect only the interests of our citing sources (cf. I. 222 on Cassius Hemina), but as part of his reduction in the scale of his account by comparison with Livy, Fenestella may have restricted his military narrative considerably. F30 does suggest that military conflict was treated conventionally, in moralizing and personalized terms, and the same appears to be true of the political narrative. The Crassus fragment (F16) betrays the familiar overemphasis on dominant personalities, and the characterization of C. Cato in F2 uses well-established moralizing stereotypes to explain and pass judgement on political conduct. The same fragment also implies a strongly conservative viewpoint, as highly critical of youthful 'populists' as Cicero or Sallust had been. The adoption of a more negative account of the younger Marius than even Sulla had probably supplied (F17) points in the same direction. Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.1. 384–6, used F21 (Cicero's alleged defence of Catiline in 65) to argue that, like other contemporaries, Fenestella took a hostile view of Cicero, but though Fenestella's assumption here must have had considerable implications for his depiction of Catiline's trial in 65 (cf. comm. ad loc.), we cannot be sure that it formed part of some wider reassessment of Cicero himself. F18, for example, could well reflect a positive interpretation of the *Pro Roscio Amerino* (cf. comm. ad loc.) and Fenestella's overall assessment may have been cynical but balanced.

F18 and F21 may also exemplify a more general interest in recondite detail. F20 shows not only that Asconius thought Fenestella worth consulting alongside Sallust and Livy for political history in the 70s BC, but that he might even hope to find there details that Fenestella's predecessors had omitted; it is Fenestella, for example, who supplies the only attested figure for the cost of aqueduct construction in the republican period (F12) or the identity of L. Calpurnius Piso's father-in-law (F22). Particularly striking may have been the use he made of precise dates. In the two attested instances (cf. F13, F23) particular reasons may have influenced their inclusion, and it is unlikely that the history was systematically organized on this basis, with a consequent loss of narrative dynamic (cf. comm. on F23); but Fenestella perhaps went beyond the more restricted practice of Livy, who supplies such dates irregularly, though not infrequently, for certain religious rituals (such as temple dedications), eclipses, and major political events (e.g. consular elections, triumphs, or comitial trials), together with those specified in senatorial decrees or the like. If so, this

presumably reflects the role of the *acta* in increasing the availability and awareness of such specifics, the development of interest at Rome in chronological questions of all kinds, and the enhanced political, scholarly, and literary importance of the calendar and dates within it in the Augustan period.

If F11 derives from the *Annales*, it raises the tantalizing possibility that Fenestella also incorporated discussion of major literary figures in his work. If so, that was a new and notable departure for a large-scale work of Roman history, so far as we know, and was presumably taken over from the chronicle tradition as it had been developed in Latin by Nepos, Atticus, and perhaps Varro: the specific argument here concerning Terence's dates certainly reflects the interest in literary chronology of the late republican period (cf. Atticus 33 F6 with comm.). However, we cannot be sure that the discussion of Terence in F11 was not a digression motivated by specific immediate concerns, not least perhaps a defence of the moral reputation of the younger Scipio. Nothing in the fragment as we have it concerns Terence's literary output.

As already noted, Pliny excerpted from Fenestella a series of notices concerned with developments in dining and dress. In themselves these are limited in scope, and attempts to attribute larger swathes of Pliny's account to Fenestella (and thus establish the major role such material played in his output) are not persuasive. How this material was integrated into Fenestella's account we cannot say. In some instances (e.g. F25) specific developments may have been linked to, and recorded in, specific contexts, as earlier historians, including Livy, had done. More gradual processes of change, however, may have been the subject of more or less extended excursuses (as perhaps were other topics such as the *quindecimviri*: cf. F19 with comm.). These fragments clearly all reflect a moralistic socio-political ideology, charting the progressive development of Roman *luxuria* that had been a significant concern of earlier historians, but perhaps in greater detail and with more obvious debts to antiquarian writing on this topic, above all Varro's *De uita populi Romani* (cf. esp. F24 with comm.). One obvious and significant feature of Fenestella's treatment is his apparent down-dating of some such developments compared with other authorities,[17] and his insistence on the continuous progress of such developments through to the conclusion of Augustus' reign (and presumably beyond), with even the emperor's conquest of Egypt a significant catalyst (F25 with comm.). That Fenestella took a critical view of these developments is virtually certain, and in keeping with the conservatism otherwise apparent in his history. A historian who remarks on the application of high fashion to the Roman citizen dress (F26) or supposes that Romans adapted the name of the patrician shoe to a luxury fish (F27) must have adopted the now conventional posture of a Cato, Sallust, or Livy. More interesting is the exact significance Fenestella attached to these supposed manifestations of moral decay. The issue remained politically significant at the time that Fenestella was writing. Restrictions in the two areas with which the relevant fragments are primarily concerned, dress and dining, were debated vigorously in AD 16 and AD 22, with varying evaluations both of the moral status of a grander lifestyle and its relationship to the

[17] Cf. Fenestella's contemporary, Nicolaus of Damascus, on the role of Lucullus as harbinger of the extravagant luxury of the Augustan period (*FGrHist* 90 F77).

wealth created by imperial expansion and of the efficiency of sumptuary legislation in curbing individual conduct.[18] The degeneration of the age remained a favoured topic in both prose and poetry, and this, like Fenestella's history, was a (sometimes explicit) acknowledgement that the advent of the principate had produced no return to the simpler ways of the past.[19] For the historian of civil strife such moral decline provided an easy (and facile) source of explanation. For Fenestella the problem of reconciling continuing decline with political stability and large-scale imperial expansion must have been much more difficult, though he might have used it to justify the necessity of the principate itself.

If the inclusion of specific, and sometimes erudite, detail was one important mechanism by which Fenestella established the credentials of his history, it is likely that he consulted a wide range of sources, and even the small quantity that survives supports this. Like Livy, he was able to contribute anecdotes he claimed to have heard from eyewitnesses (F16) and also probably claimed to chart cultural developments from first-hand observation (F24), but for the most part his material must have been drawn from perhaps extensive reading. In diverging from, and supplementing, Livy he probably consulted some of Livy's own predecessors such as Macer and/or Sisenna (F5, F10), though if he used first-hand accounts such as Sulla's *Memoirs*, he was evidently prepared to offer an alternative version without (apparently) explanation or justification (F17). He may also have used primary materials such as the pontifical records (F13) and Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* (F21) but this is highly uncertain (see comm. ad locc.). The error in F23 might imply that Fenestella did not use the *acta*, but that would be surprising and in this instance a slip of the pen, by author or copyist, may explain the discrepancy. Direct use of individual antiquarian works cannot be demonstrated, but his awareness of the progressive nature of cultural change was surely sharpened by familiarity with the antiquarians; he clearly introduced material that was of particular interest to the antiquarian tradition, could adopt a manner of exposition and argument that was particularly at home there (F24), and use methods, in particular etymology (F6–7, 10, 27), that were part of the antiquarian stock-in-trade. None of this was necessarily foreign to earlier historical writing and Fenestella may have consciously revived some of the purview and scope of historians such as Hemina, but in giving his history a distinctive character he may well have drawn much more freely on the wealth of scholarly writing, much of it itself of a moralizing character, that had grown up over the previous century or more.

The incorporation of such material did not mean a radical rewriting of political or military history, but it was perhaps this in particular that gave Fenestella his reputation as a historian marked by his assiduity (*diligentissimus scriptor*: T4), a reputation that endured into the Middle Ages.[20] Such judgements may be generous.

[18] Tac. *ann.* 2.33.1–4; Dio 57.15.2 (AD 16); Tac. *ann.* 3.52.1–55.1 (AD 22); cf. Suet. *Tib.* 34.1; M. Coudry, *CCG* 15 (2004), 144–5, 149–51, 156–7.

[19] So, for example, Velleius does not include the curbing of *luxuria* among the achievements of Augustus (2.89.3–4) or Tiberius (2.126.2–4).

[20] Middle Ages: *GL* Suppl. 236.23–5; cf. 92.16. For the Renaissance cf. the attribution to Fenestella (in some copies) of the work *De Romanorum magistratibus* in fact written by Andrea Fiocchi (d. 1452): J. Monfasani, *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988), 36.

That Asconius cited Fenestella almost only in instances where he believed he could convict him of error (F18, F21, F23) may give a false impression of the level of accuracy in an author he evidently used systematically. Nonetheless, Fenestella may have been guilty of carelessness, not least in interpreting his primary materials (cf. comm. on F21). He certainly demonstrates the same capacity as others of his own day and earlier for facile use of evidence for the remote past (F6), implausible sweeping assertion (F11), tendentious accounts of individual conduct (F17), and misconceived etymology (F27). And although we obviously cannot discount the possibility that Fenestella broke new ground in his historical interpretation, the evidence we have suggests an essentially conventional approach.

Judgements about Fenestella's style can only be tentative, but he clearly did not copy Sallust's abrupt, aggressive manner. Both in language and style the few direct quotations we possess point unmistakably to Cicero and Livy as the principal models (see esp. F2, F30). In vocabulary there is some indication of further development of earlier usage (F2, F30), with perhaps occasional features that might be deemed inappropriate in high style (F1) or terms that were only now coming into fashion (see on F4, F31). F1 and F2 suggest that smoothness, balance, and subtle *uariatio* were significant features, but it is not likely that Fenestella was a stylist of the first rank. He is, for example, absent from the series of extracts on the death and character of Cicero that the elder Seneca assembles from earlier historians (*suas.* 6.14–25): evidently whatever account he gave was notable neither for its thought nor expression. Yet he was capable of combining concision with clarity (F2), could introduce poetic colouring (ibid.), and may well have provided examples of lively, colourful, and dramatic narrative (cf. F16, F29). Certainly there is no solid basis for the general dismissal of Fenestella as a writer devoid of literary capacity or merit:[21] where he adopted an austere formality of style (cf. F13), that was surely for conscious effect.

The success of Fenestella's *Annales* is perhaps indicated by the appearance of the *Epitomae* (F31). Our one citation takes the form of an indirect question. If, as seems most likely, this was governed by a verb such as *refertur* ('it is related'),[22] it implies that the *Epitomae* was a summary of the contents of the main history, perhaps book by book, like the surviving *periochae* of Livy,[23] rather than a consecutive narrative based (principally) on Fenestella's larger text, as the term 'epitome' would more typically indicate. That the *Epitomae* had only reached their second book (i.e. roll) by the 70s BC would support this hypothesis, since this implies a much smaller-scale work in proportion to the original than is otherwise usual.[24] Whether the *Epitomae* were by a

[21] e.g. J. C. Bramble, *CHCL* 2. 492. Contrast Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 148.

[22] Cf. e.g. Livy *per.* 63 (*idque incestum quem ad modum et commissum et deprehensum et uindicatum sit refertur*). Alternative hypotheses are possible (e.g. that F31 comes from the report of a speech, such as Antony's funeral oration for Caesar) but less obviously plausible.

[23] Thus diluting, at least at the level of terminology, the sharp distinction commonly drawn (e.g. Opelt, *RAC* 5 (1962), 944–5) between an epitome and a summary of contents. If Fenestella was himself the author of the *Epitomae*, it is theoretically possible that these were summaries of the contents of a work or works by others (cf. 1. 596–7), but in that case we should expect some identification of the work(s) in question.

[24] Cf. Opelt, *RAC* 5 (1962), 958–9.

later hand or (as Diomedes' language might suggest) by Fenestella himself, with potential ramifications for the chronology of his life, we cannot say.[25]

Although not all the later citations of Fenestella need imply first-hand knowledge of his text, he was clearly widely read at least in the first two centuries of the empire, with the result that other material derived from him must appear unattributed in later authors. Asconius, for example, must have made more extensive use of him than the citations themselves attest (cf. comm. on F2 for a possible instance), and he has been suggested both as the missing authority cited in *Corn.* 56St=70C and as the source responsible for misdating the *In Pisonem* lost from Asconius' text at *Pis.* 12St=1C.[26] Neither proposal is more than conjecture, however, and they typify the uncertainties that also bedevil attempts to trace material from Fenestella in the elder Pliny and/or Plutarch.[27] We have similarly no concrete grounds for attributing to Fenestella the narrative of *POxy* 2088 (=Anonymus 1 (109)) as proposed by H. Stuart Jones.[28]

The fragments are divided into four principal categories: (i) those explicitly attributed to the *Annales*; (ii) those where the work is unspecified; (iii) the attested fragment of the *Epitomae*; (iv) two citations probably fabricated by Fulgentius. Within category ii, fragments referring to datable events or periods are given first in chronological order (F5–26), followed by the remainder in chronological order of the citing source (F27–30).

(AD)

[25] Discussion and bibliography in M. Galdi, *L'epitome nella letteratura latina* (Naples, 1922), 260–1. The *Epitomae* might, for example, have been compiled from a summary of contents prefixed to each book by Fenestella or a later hand, as has sometimes been supposed in the case of Livy (e.g. A. Klotz, *Hermes* 48 (1913), 549). So, for example, the *prologi* to Trogus' universal history list the contents of each book and commonly use an *ut* formula (followed by either indicative or subjunctive) and the summaries of contents prefixed to the individual books of Dio's history regularly take the form: 'These are the contents of the xth book of Dio's Roman history: how. . .; how. . .; etc.'

[26] Cf. Marshall, *RhM* 123 (1980), 352–3. On the first passage cf. comm. on Antias 25 F41; on the second 1. 403 n. 10.

[27] Cf. e.g. E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 32 (1897), 595–603; Reitzenstein in *Festschr. J. Vahlen* (1900), 411–20; H. Radnitsky, *Jahresbericht über das K.K. Akademische Gymnasium in Wien für das Schuljahr 1908–1909* (Vienna, 1909), 18; E. Alfisi, *CSDIR* 6 (1974–5), 9–29; G. Delvaux, *LEC* 56 (1988), 27–48; 57 (1989), 127–146; 61 (1993), 13–23, 115–30.

[28] See A. S. Hunt, comm. on *POxy* 2088; cf. M. A. Levi, *RFIC* 56 (1928), 511–15; comm. on Anonymus 1 (109).

71

A. Cremutius Cordus

Editions: Peter 2. cxiii–cxv, 87–90, 225.

Principal discussions: F. Ritter, 'Der geistige und entgiftete Ausgabe der Annalen des Cremutius Cordus', *Philologus* 6 (1851), 752–4; K. Nipperdey, 'Zur Geschichte der römischen Historiographie', *Philologus* 6 (1851), 139–40 (=*Opuscula* (Berlin, 1877), 409–10); R. G. Columba, 'Il processo di Cremuzio Cordo', *A&R* 4 (1901), 361–82; C. Cichorius, 'A. Cremutius (2) Cordus', *RE* 4 (1901), 1703–4; K. Nipperdey, ed., *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Ab excessu Divi Aug. I VI* (11th edn., rev. G. Andresen, Berlin, 1915) (with *Einleitung*); *XI-XVI* (6th edn., 1908); E. Kornemann, 'Die unmittelbare Vorlage von Appians Emphylia', *Klio* 17 (1921), 33–43; A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} (1933), C 1465; R. S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius* (Middletown, Conn., 1935), 85–7; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 643–4; F. A. Marx, 'Der Prozess des Historikers Cremutius Cordus', *Gymnasium* 48 (1937), 140–5; J. Schwartz, 'L'Ombre d'Antoine et les débuts du Principat: à propos des commentaires perdus d'Horace', *MH* 5 (1948), 155–67; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 162–4; F. Klingner, 'Tacitus und die Geschichtsschreiber des 1. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.', *MH* 15 (1958), 194–206, esp. 197–8 (=*Röm. Geisteswelt*^{4} (1961), 469–89); M. A. Levi, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Vitae Caesarum Libro II Divus Augustus* (2nd edn., Rome, 1958), lv–lxi; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 337–8; S. Desideri, 'Note sull'Agricola di Tacito', *GIF* 13 (1960), 150–6; C. Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales* (2nd edn. Rome, 1963), 109; R. S. Rogers, 'The case of Cremutius Cordus', *TAPhA* 96 (1965), 351–9; H. Tränkle, 'Augustus bei Tacitus, Cassius Dio u. dem älteren Plinius', *WS* 3 (1969), 108–30, esp. 123; W. Suerbaum, 'Der Historiker und die Freiheit des Wortes: die Rede des Cremutius Cordus bei Tacitus Ann. 4, 34/35', in G. Radke (ed.), *Politik und literarische Kunst im Werke des Tacitus* (Stuttgart, 1971), 61–99; R. A. Bauman, *Impietas in Principem* (Munich, 1974), 99–104; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976); R.Till, 'Plinius über Augustus (nat. hist. 7, 147–150)', *WJA* 3 (1977), 127–38, esp. 137; Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus* (1979), 254–7; H. Tränkle, 'Zu Cremutius Cordus fr.4 Peter', *MH* 37 (1980), 231–41; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984); M. Meier, 'Das Ende des Cremutius Cordus und die Bedingungen für Historiographie in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit', *Tyche* 18 (2003), 91–127; M. R. McHugh, 'Historiography and freedom of speech: the case of Cremutius Cordus', in I. Sluiter, R. M. Rosen (eds.), *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity* (Boston, 2004), 391–408.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Dio says (T5) that in the year of his death Aulus Cremutius Cordus was on the threshold of old age, just under 60, then, and so born in 35 BC or a little after. It was the view of Cichorius and Bardon, based on F5, that Cordus might have spent time in Egypt; that is putting considerable weight on the language of the passage.[1] He was

[1] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 162 n. 7; Schanz–Hosius 2^4. 863.

tried in the senate and was presumably a member, and although he is not known to have gone beyond the qualifying quaestorship the wording of T2 suggests a remark made in the senate, which would indicate that Cremutius had reached a more senior rank. His comment on the erection of a statue of Sejanus in the Theatre of Pompey, which had burnt down in AD 22 (Tac. *ann.* 3.72.4), led to his prosecution by Satrius Secundus and Pinarius Natta. The formal charge recorded was his praise of Cassius the Liberator, though scholars have postulated others in addition, or suggested that Cremutius honoured the Liberators precisely for the assassination.[2] The alternative explanation, that the history was not the basis of the charge, but rather some treasonable activity,[3] is hardly to be maintained in the face of the testimony of Dio (T5), Tacitus (T6 and F3a), and Suetonius (F3b) — easily refuted if untrue. After a spirited defence Cordus went home and starved himself to death (T6, T7). Momigliano believed that, according to Seneca (T2), Cordus committed suicide before the trial; he never delivered the speech that Tacitus has put into his mouth.[4] That would be a serious breach of a historian's duty on Tacitus' part. Another explanation may be found: that the accusers' approach to the consuls refers to their intervention when the trial was already in progress. Admittedly that does not dispose of all the difficulties. If Cremutius originally concealed his determination to starve himself, perhaps feigning illness, the trial must have continued; possibly he had already embarked on his *abstinentia* before he made his speech (Tacitus, T6, describes him as *relinquendae vitae certus*). That does not mean that Tacitus was aware of the contents of Cremutius' speech and reproduced them.[5]

Works

It was the view of Bardon, based on material that emerges in Pliny (T4, F5, F6), that Cordus wrote, besides his histories, a work of 'curiosités'.[6] Manuwald, on the other

[2] Columba (*A&R* 4 (1901), 371–2) stresses political charges, with reference to F7 and T4–5. He compares Cordus with Labienus and notes the language of Val. Max. 1.8.8, in his view written under Tiberius but after the death of Sejanus in 31: *Cassius numquam sine praefatione publici parricidii nominandus*; but for the date of this passage see Briscoe, *Sileno* 19 (1993), 398–404, and noting at 405 that the fate of Cordus clearly made it very dangerous not to display hostility towards the tyrannicides. Columba's view was followed by Questa (*Studi sulle fonti degli annales*², 109). See also W. M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill and London, 1992), 147–8 n. 2: the real reason for Cordus' fall was the conflict with Sejanus. Suerbaum ('Der Historiker und die Freiheit' (1971), 64 n. 8, 68–9 with n. 20) argues that both Labienus and Cordus were unable to face the burning of their work. Noè (*Storiografia imperiale*, 74) distinguishes the case of the orator from that of the historian.

[3] Rogers, *Criminal Trials* (1935), 87, following E. B. Marsh (*The Reign of Tiberius* (Oxford, 1931), 290–93); also Rogers, *TAPhA* 96 (1965), esp. 352–3, with n. 5 for a list of those who accept his view, including Syme (*Tacitus*, 337 n. 10); the charge was *maiestas* (357).

[4] Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990), 113. So already Columba, *A&R* 4 (1901), 367–9: 'Le due versioni non sono conciliabili', followed by E. Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), 301–2. Rogers (*Criminal Trials* (1935), 86 n. 276) suggests a speech immediately after the demand for an indictment.

[5] Suerbaum ('Der Historiker und die Freiheit' (1971), 63, 66–7), taking a more favourable view than Syme (*Tacitus*, 337 n. 10); bibliography in Suerbaum 98–9.

[6] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 162 n. 7, followed by E. de Saint Denis (Budé edn. Pliny, 1961), 126 on *nat.* 10.74 (=F5). *Contra*: Columba, *A&R* 4 (1901), 363.

hand, writes that it is not safe to assume that Pliny's 'Cordus' is our Cremutius at all.[7] The first assumption is unnecessary: Livy figures before Cordus in the list of sources for *nat.* 7, and prodigies figure in his history; possible settings for these picturesque details are discussed in the commentary. On the other point, while Cordus is not a very rare *cognomen*, our historian was so well known that Pliny's readers might have been expected to take this Cordus for him.

According to Dio (T7), Cordus had written his history long before the arraignment (πάλαι), and he gave readings of his work before Augustus. The readings were likely to have been selective,[8] and it has even been suggested that the work was known in two editions, Augustan and Tiberian, but this is a scholarly counsel of despair.[9]

The scope of the *Annales*, as they may have been called (F3a), is uncertain. Dio's statement that he had no ill to say of Caesar (T7) makes it possible that they covered more than the Second Triumvirate and the Augustan period, but Caesar may have appeared only in a recapitulation. They seem to have dealt with a single generation which certainly included the Triumvirate and at least the earlier regime of Augustus (T6, T7, F1–4), and if A. H. M. Jones was right to treat the *lectio* described by Suetonius (F4: see comm.) as belonging to 29 BC, we can be sure only that they continued to that year, when the triple triumph of 13–15 August would have been a natural stopping-point. The topic was discussed more recently by Manuwald, with the same passage as a basis, and he is sceptical of the view that Cremutius handled the Augustan principate, rather than confining himself to the civil war period; the work could have been finished and published before Augustus' death, with a concluding date of 28/7 BC.[10] Perhaps he went on to the return to constitutional government in 28–27, or to the conclusion of the Cantabrian War, like Augustus' own memoirs (Augustus 60 T1); for the possibility that mentions of Memnon's daughters and Phyllis (F5, F6) stem from events in the 20s and teens, see commentary.

For all his praise of the Liberators, Cremutius may have laid blame for the civil wars at the door of senate and people (T7). His work was well regarded for its eloquence, but Seneca the Elder disparaged his efforts to laud Cicero (F2). The second great quality of history-writing, *fides*, was attributed to him by Seneca's son, unsurprisingly in a *consolatio* addressed to Cordus' daughter Marcia. The senate had the *Annales* burned, but copies survived and were circulated, thanks to her (T1; others however had concealed copies of the work, T7). After Tiberius' death Gaius Caligula revoked the ban on it (in the *mutatio temporum* mentioned by Seneca (T1)),

[7] Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 256 n. 564, citing Tränkle, *WS* 3 (1969), 108–30, esp. 123, and referring to the historical catalogue of misfortunes that afflicted Augustus (Pliny *nat.* 7.147–50) that might have gone back to him. Tränkle's view is based on the allusion to Cordus in the source list of Pliny *nat.* 7 (T4); cf. R. Till, *WJA* 3 (1977), 127–37. The catalogue did not merely expose Augustus' wounds but would have been deeply offensive to Tiberius. It cannot have been published until after his death. In Till's view (137) the passage is a counterblast to Augustus' *res gestae*, although he notes the resemblance of the phraseology of Cordus at Tac. *ann.* 4.34.5 (*haud facile dixerim moderatione magis an sapientia*) and the end of the catalogue (*caelumque nescio adeptus magis an meritus*).

[8] Schwartz, *MH* 5 (1948), 159 n. 25. Noè (*Storiografia imperiale*, 72) calls the polemic 'mediata', 'indiretta'; see n. 285 for a Tiberian publication date, queried by Suerbaum, 'Der Historiker und die Freiheit' (1971), 86.

[9] Suerbaum ('Der Historiker und die Freiheit' (1971), 80–1) thinks of a purged edition for Augustus; see also Bauman, *Impietas in principem* (1974), 103.

[10] Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 255 n. 557.

and it seems that Marcia responded to this gesture by bringing out new copies; even then, however, only a bowdlerized version was to be read;[11] yet Cordus' high-mindedness and boldness of expression were still evident in it, so Quintilian felt (T5).

Even though the animus of the prosecution came from Sejanus' hostility, the pretext of a history of the triumviral period is not surprising. It was a minefield from which the young Claudius was kept.[12] Tiberius was connected with Antony through his father's political affiliations and his brother Nero Drusus' marriage to Antonia Minor. While Brutus and Cassius were the opponents of both Octavian and Antony, the Antonian connection may help to explain differences between Tiberius' attitude to Cordus' work and that of his predecessor Augustus (cf. F1). The simplest explanation, however, is that during the last decade of Augustus' principate and the early years of Tiberius policy hardened as dynastic struggles destabilized the regime.[13]

Gaius Caligula was a descendant not only of Augustus but of Antony, and made much of the fact;[14] but reacting at the beginning of his reign against his predecessor's repression, he may have thought that rehabilitating Cordus was a particularly valuable point in his own favour.

The fate of the history was known to Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio, and it is likely that Tacitus actually read it, but Peter doubted whether this was common;[15] certainly Suetonius seems to have used it as a source (F4), as Manuwald points out.[16] Its absence from the list of banned authors in Tac. *Agr.* 2.1 has been noticed,[17] but it would have been chronologically out of place there. Pliny mentions it, but its relevance to his *Natural History* was surely marginal. The suspicion arises that it was for political correctness, or notoriety, that it was regarded rather than for intrinsic merit. Manuwald is particularly cautious,[18] rebutting the view of F. G. B. Millar that Cordus was used by Dio: Dio's closeness to Tac. *ann.* 4.34.1 shows only that they knew the same tradition. However, he acknowledges that Dio's attitude to Brutus and Cassius may have been influenced by Cordus' views.

However, it is the combination of *eloquentia* and *libertas* that Klingner stresses in his discussion, writing of the 'zurückgepresste Groll des Werkes' and referring to T2, and its significance not only for Cordus' near-contemporaries under Claudius, but for Tacitus as well (he calls Tac. *hist.* 1.1.1 to mind).[19] In an elaborate argument Schwartz suggested that Cordus' work, deriving in part from Augustus' memoirs, was the source of Suet. *Aug.* 30 and Dio 53.22.1, was copied by the Antonine scholiast Helenius Acron in his commentary on Horace, especially *sat.* 2.1.229–59, and passed by way of Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (*c.*330–94) into John of Salisbury's

[11] Suet. *Cal.* 16. In the view of Ritter (*Philologus* 6 (1851), 753), 'eine Ausgabe, worin der Vater sich kaum wieder erkannt hätte'; but some readers of the first edition survived to remember it; see Suerbaum, 'Der Historiker und die Freiheit' (1971), 77 n. 41.

[12] Suet. *Claud.* 41.2 (=Claudius 75 T1).

[13] Cf. Bauman, *Impietas in principem* (1974), 103.

[14] This point is made by Schwartz, *MH* 5 (1948), 159, citing Suet. *Cal.* 23.1 for Gaius' hatred of Augustus.

[15] Peter 2. cxvii; Columba (*A&R* 4 (1901), 363) noted his absence from the later record.

[16] Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 256 n. 261.

[17] Desideri, *GIF* 13 (1960), 154.

[18] Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 254, on Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 84–5.

[19] Klingner, *Röm. Geisteswelt*[4], 474.

Policraticus: 8.14.768c and 769a. Cordus, by alluding to the contention between Antony and Octavian over the theft of works of art from Asia and the melting down of statues for the public benefit (cf. *res gestae* 24; Vell. 2. 83), showed an Augustus sensitive to public opinion and pursued by the shadow of Antony. It would be too bold on this slender basis to include these passages among the fragments. Admittedly Dio (T7) speaks of a ἱστορία περὶ τῶν τῷ Αὐγούστῳ πραχθέντων, which recalls the title of Augustus' memoir,[20] but the phrase is not distinctive. Schwartz's secondary conclusion, that the work was published between 14 and 25, also depends on its being brought out as a unity.

In the view of Levi, Cordus, though he is mentioned as a source only in chapter 35, provided passages in Suetonius hostile to Augustus, notably 9–16, derived, he argues, from an annalistic source friendly to Antony, whose letters the accused author is made by Tacitus to point out were still in circulation.[21] Equally, Cremutius is claimed by Kornemann as the immediate source of Appian's *Civil Wars*; the preface, he claims, belongs to a bigger work than Appian's, one that went on into the reign of Augustus; like Cremutius, Appian brings on Cassius as the 'last of the Romans'.[22] Both hypotheses are speculative.

(BML)

[20] Schwartz, *MH* 5 (1948), 161 n. 36.

[21] Levi (on Suet. *Aug.*², lvii) notes that Ciaceri (*Processi politici* (cit. n. 4), 5–6) rejects this view, although he admits that the biography has a distinctly unfavourable attitude to Augustus' early career. Antony's letters: Tac. *ann.* 4.34.8.

[22] Kornemann, *Klio* 17 (1921), 33–43; see already the comments of Columba, *A&R* 4 (1901), 364; W. Ensslin, *Klio* 20 (1926), 463–4.

72

Bruttedius Niger

Editions: Peter 2. cxvi, 90.

Principal discussions: F. Bücheler, 'Grammatisches. Onomatologicum', *RhM* 11 (1857), 295; A. Henze, 'Bruttedius (2) Niger', *RE* 3 (1899), 907; A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} (1933), B 158; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 356–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 162; S. H. Rutledge, *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian* (London and New York, 2001).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Bruttedius (Bruttidius in Juvenal,[1] T3) was an ambitious accuser under Tiberius, in 22 joining as aedile the *repetundae* case against C. Silanus brought by the provincials of Asia, when he, the consular Mam. Scaurus, and the praetor Junius Otho[2] added a charge of violating the divinity of Augustus and the *maiestas* of Tiberius. The magistracy suggests that he was born some time before 6 BC. Tacitus (T2) regards him as a talented man driven to the bad by overreaching himself; he perished in AD 31 among the friends of Sejanus (T3).

Works

Seneca the Elder notes (T1) that Bruttedius was, like Augustus, a pupil of Apollodorus of Pergamum,[3] and an outstanding one; as a declaimer he may be found exploiting a *color* previously developed by Junius Otho.[4] Although the paragraphs he preserves, as Peter points out, are rhetorical in tone (see comm.), Seneca[5] includes Bruttedius amongst those historians whose account of Cicero's death he cites (*suas.* 6.16). The scope of the history is unknown, but it covered the proscriptions and so very probably at least the triumviral period. It is interesting that Bruttedius presumably embarked on his historical work before he had given up hope of the consulship. If the name of Bruttedius survived in Juvenal (T3), it was not perhaps because of his literary work (Juvenal in this passage may be reworking, to satirical effect, Tacitus' account of the fall of Sejanus, and the reference to Bruttedius could be a pointer to Tacitus' description of his demise); but the history may have included contemporary events, and if so was perhaps over-complimentary towards Sejanus.

(BML)

[1] The more recent form, according to Bücheler, *RhM* 11 (1857), 295.

[2] For this rhetorician see *PIR*^{1} (1936), I 788.

[3] On this man and the controversy with Theodorus of Gadara, see G. M. A. Grube, *AJPh* 80 (1959), 337–65, esp. 337–52.

[4] Sen. *contr.* 2.1.35. [5] Sen. *suas.* 6.16.

73

Ti. Claudius Nero (Ti. [Julius] Caesar Augustus)

Editions: Peter 2. cxviiii, 92.

Principal discussions: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 330–1; M. Gelzer, 'Ti. Iulius (154) Caesar Augustus', *RE* 10 (1917), 478–536; F. B. Marsh, *The Reign of Tiberius* (Oxford, 1931); G. Lienhart, *Tiberius Caligula Claudius Nero quid extra munera imperatoria scripserint* (Diss. Freiburg, 1934); Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 419–22; A. Stein, *PIR*² (1936), C 941; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 171; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), esp. 277, 284, 319, 423; R. Seager, *Tiberius* (London, 1972; 2nd edn., 2005); B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London, 1976; 2nd edn., 1999); Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle* (1990), 76–9; R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 692–4.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Tiberius, born 16 November 42 BC, was the son of a patrician senator who reached only praetorian rank and who attached himself, first to Caesar, then to Mark Antony. He died young, after having divorced his wife Livia Drusilla so that she might marry Octavian, and Tiberius, like his younger brother Nero Drusus, was brought up in the house of Augustus. He was quaestor in 23 BC and enjoyed a distinguished military career (three triumphs), with the consulship accelerated to 13 BC. In 11 he married Augustus' widowed daughter Julia, and in 6, after a second consulship, was granted tribunician power and *imperium* in the east. However, he retired from public life and spent seven years on Rhodes, returning as a private citizen in AD 2. Two years later, Augustus' adopted sons having died, he too was adopted alongside the young Agrippa Postumus; his name accordingly changed from Ti. Claudius Nero to Ti. Julius Caesar. *Imperium* and tribunician power made him unassailable, and he stepped into Augustus' position in 14, becoming emperor as Ti. Caesar Augustus. The death of his heirs Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, and the political turmoil that followed, led to a second, permanent, retirement, to Campania and Capri, in 26, and he died at Misenum on 16 March 37, to almost universal rejoicing.

Works

Tiberius was cultivated in art and philosophy, and a learned literary man with a particular taste for *historia fabularis*; he wrote erotic epigrams, as well as an elegy on

[1] Sources in Stein *PIR*² C 941; chronological outlines in Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*, 76–7.

the death of L. Caesar. His written style, like his oratory, was criticized as obscure, but his talent was admired by Tacitus.[2] The only known prose work was the (evidently single-book) *Commentarius de uita sua* (F1)—unless Suetonius added the word *commentarius* to the authentic title, as Peter suggests (2. cxviiii); and *composuit* implies something more than mere notes.[3]

As to the mendacity of this work, on which Peter insists, see commentary. Certainly it was written towards the end of his life, after the death of Sejanus in October 31. Peter, noting Suetonius' characterization of it (*breuiter ac summatim*), draws the plausible conclusion that Tiberius was aiming at antique simplicity and imitated the succinct style of public monuments rather than the copiousness of Sulla, Cicero, and Caesar, and even listed his subjects under headings rather than narrating the material. The immediate precedent would have been the *Res gestae diui Augusti*, if that document had not had a publicist's aim and triumphalist contents; Tiberius' *de uita sua* may well have been apologetic rather than a list of achievements.

It is a question whether the *Commentarius* (as Suetonius calls it) was identical with the *commentarii* that were Domitian's preferred reading (T1).[4] These might have been *commentarii* in the other sense, of records, and it is likely that they would have drawn the interest of an emperor preoccupied with administration rather than a memoir which was unlikely to proclaim any deep secrets of state (*contra* Peter l.c., though he distinguishes between their contents and those of the *uita*).

(BML)

[2] Suet. *Tib.* 70; Pliny *epist.* 5.3.5. For Tacitus, see Syme, *Tacitus*, 319, on *ann.* 13.3.2.

[3] For *commentarius*, see Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 692–4, who includes the Tiberian work in another category, that of 'whole lives', and suggests that it might be a draft for Tiberius' *res gestae*, naturally left in an archive after his death. The force of *composuit* was noted by Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 330.

[4] See Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*[2] (1999), 222.

74

L. (?) Annaeus Seneca (Maior)

Editions: Peter 2. cxviii–cxviiii, 91–2; M. Winterbottom, *The Elder Seneca: Declamations* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1974), 1. xxi–ii; 2. 614–17.

Principal discussions: L. Spengel, 'Über die Geschichtsbücher des Florus', *ABAW* 9.1 (1861), 345–6; E. Westerburg, 'Lucan, Florus, and Pseudo-Victor', *RhM* 37 (1882), 35–49; G. F. Unger, 'Die vier Zeitalter des Florus', *Philologus* 43 (1888), 429–43, esp. 438–41; A. Klotz, 'Das Geschichtswerk des älteren Seneca', *RhM* 56 (1901), 429–42; O. Rossbach, 'L. Annaeus (16) Seneca', *RE* 1 (1899), 2237–40 and Suppl. 1 (1903), 84–5; L. Castiglioni, 'Lattanzio e le storie di Seneca padre', *RFIC* 56 (1928), 454–75; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 341; L. Wickert, *PIR*[2] (1933), A 616; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958); L. Hahn, 'Appien et le cercle de Sénèque', *AntHung* 12 (1964), 169–206; M. T. Griffin, 'The elder Seneca and Spain', *JRS* 62 (1972), 1–19; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976), 83, 86, 95; L. A. Sussman, *The Elder Seneca* (Leiden, 1978), esp. 137–52; J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge, 1981); S. Demougin, *Prosopographie des Chevaliers romains Julio-Claudiens (43 av. J.-C.–70 ap. J.C.)* (Rome, 1992), 282, no. 333.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The wealthy and distinguished writer on declamation (not 'the rhetor'; that sobriquet has been abandoned[1]) Annaeus Seneca had his biography written by his son, the philosopher L. Annaeus Seneca minor (T1). Only some MSS yield the *praenomen* Lucius, and scholars have suspected that copyists have confused him with his son, though Griffin prints L. without hesitation.[2] If the younger Seneca had been the eldest of his three sons (Novatus was adopted as Junius Gallio, and Mela was the youngest[3]) the *praenomen* would have been that much more likely, but he seems to have been the second son.[4] He was a native of the Roman colony of Corduba in Hispania Baetica,[5] and his *nomen* reveals Italian, ultimately Illyrian, origin.[6] He was an eques,[7] born some time before the death of Cicero in 43 BC[8] (about 50 BC, according to Fordyce and Winterbottom, 54 at the latest in Rossbach's view). He remained quietly at home for fear of the civil wars,[9] but when the seas became clear in the mid-30s he moved to Rome and certainly heard Asinius Pollio, himself a historian, both in his prime and in old age.[10] Seneca was at the centre of cultural and political activity,

[1] See Sussman, *The Elder Seneca* (1978), 25. [2] Griffin, *Seneca*, 29 and elsewhere.
[3] Sen. *ad Helv.* 2.4.
[4] So Rossbach, *RE* 1. 2236 (no.17); Griffin, *Seneca*, 32; Fordyce and Winterbottom, *OCD*[4] 92.
[5] Mart. 1.61.7. For the Spanish roots of the Senecas, see Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 12–17.
[6] Syme, *Tacitus*, 590, 784. [7] Tac. *ann.* 14.53. [8] Sen. *contr.* 1 *pr.*11. [9] Ibid.
[10] Sen. *contr.* 4 *pr.* 2–4. It may be that he met Pollio in his boyhood, when Pollio was governor (44–43 BC) and in Corduba: Broughton, *MRR* 2. 327 and 343. Griffin (*Seneca*, 31–2) speaks of 'friendship' between Pollio and the Annaei.

though he did not enter the senate or plead in the courts.[11] He returned to Spain in about 8 BC, and probably while there married another native of the province, Helvia.[12] He was back in Rome by about AD 5 for the education of his children.[13] He died in the reign of Gaius, AD 39 or 40, before his son's exile in 41.[14]

Work

Seneca's attention to current affairs under Augustus is attested by his most famous works, the *Controuersiae* and *Suasoriae*. He had a high regard for history, as Castiglioni pointed out,[15] and would have had access to first-hand information; his accounts of contemporary orators and their subjects remain useful to historians. Above all he valued Livy (*suas.* 6.22), and thought well of Pollio (6.25), less so of Cremutius Cordus (6.23).[16] The *Historiae*, his magnum opus,[17] are known from Tr. They started from the beginning of the civil wars, i.e. 49 BC, or 43 at the latest;[18] attempts such as that of Rossbach[19] to associate the civil wars with an earlier period, those of the age of Marius and Sulla, or even the unrest that went with the tribunates of the Gracchi (and that crisis was associated with the fall of Carthage, which the author does mention), are unconvincing:[20] thirty years elapsed between the dictatorship of Sulla and Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon, and they were not filled with civil war; the work would lack a crisp starting point. Certainly it concluded near the end of Seneca's own life. Such an extensive work was unlikely to have been begun only after he completed the rhetorical work, and it may have been carried on for a number of years. It was not published in his own lifetime. Either Seneca died before completing it or he withheld it from fear of seeming to curry favour and seek advancement (as the elder Pliny claimed to have done), or he feared that its frankness would be dangerous for him; he is said to have made the civil wars his starting point in order to provide a true record (his son praises his *antiquus rigor*[21]). The *Histories*, then, were published by the younger Seneca

[11] The beginnings of an official career are suggested in *contr.* 2 *pr.* 4.

[12] Both Novatus and Seneca the Younger were born in Spain: Stat. *silu.* 2.7.30–2; Sen. *ad Helu.* 19.2. Helvia's origins: Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 8.

[13] Griffin, *Seneca*, 32 n. 6.

[14] For the evidence see Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 4–5: Seneca quotes the works of Cremutius Cordus and Cassius Severus, which had been banned under Tiberius (*contr.* 1 *pr.* 10; *suas.* 6.19, 23).

[15] Castiglioni, *RFIC* 56 (1928), 454, citing *suas.* 5.8.

[16] See Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (1981), 306.

[17] Griffin, *Seneca*, 33; full discussion of the *seria res* of *contr.* 10 *pr.* 1: *JRS* 62 (1972), 9.

[18] The word *ueritas* in Tr is taken by Sussman, *The Elder Seneca* (1978), 146–7 to mean 'righteousness, truth, and integrity', and this naturally tends to the view that the period covered by Seneca goes back to the Gracchan age; as a parallel he cites Mart. 10.72.8–13; even if that parallel is exact, he also mentions, for the narrower, verbal sense of 'truth', Tac. *hist.* 1.1, and in the context of history-writing this seems preferable; for *ueritas* cf. Coelius 15 F2.

[19] Rossbach, *RE* Suppl. 1. 84; cf. Hahn *AAntHung* 12 (1964), 169–206: accepting F2 as the work of the historian Seneca, he also supposes that the history covered the civil wars of the age of Sulla and Marius.

[20] Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 438 are firmly against this early date; so Klotz, *RhM* 56 (1901), 437–8; Castiglioni, *RFIC* 56 (1928), 458.

[21] Sen. *dial.* 12.3. Sussman (*The Elder Seneca* (1978), 144, with bibl. n. 22) regards the work as written for limited private circulation. There does not seem to be any evidence for this view, which offers an unsatisfactory halfway house on the question of publication. The younger Seneca writes of putting the work into the hands of the public.

either soon after his father's death[22] or more probably only after his return from exile in 49 (T1)—if they were published at all. Griffin points out that Seneca's son states an intention of publishing, but may have been deterred by the reappearance of the work of A. Cremutius Cordus, with which it could not compete, and the respect due to the imperial historian Claudius Caesar.[23] This scepticism, which had been anticipated by Klotz,[24] is not altogether convincing: apart from the unlikelihood of a blatant failure to carry out what Seneca admits was his father's wish, the republication of Cordus' work might rather have acted as an encouragement to Seneca's son, and Claudius, who had been deterred from completing his own work on the same period, might have had some sympathy with a commoner's expressing views that were unsuitable for one of Augustus' family and succession.[25] Indeed, Sussman quite plausibly regards T1 not as part of an independent biography, but as the opening of Seneca's introduction to the published histories.

Griffin (*Seneca*, 197–8) notices the influence of Sallust in F2 and rebuts the idea that such expressions as *aemula imperi Romani* (Sall. *Cat.* 10) were imported by Lactantius himself: the thought of the passage that follows the mention of the fall of Carthage (itself Sallust's turning-point for Rome) is Sallustian. She points out that both Senecas were interested in Sallust.

Two probable fragments are printed in this edition. Already Klotz (*RhM* 56 (1901), 442) concluded that 'wir von den historiae des Vaters keine Spuren haben'. He was answered by Rossbach two years later, but Syme denies the authenticity of both as fragments of the elder Seneca,[26] against a number of earlier writers.[27] They are described as being by 'Seneca', and there is justice in his and others' claim that the *cognomen* by itself is most easily understood to refer to the son: 'one must allow for works of Seneca that have not survived.' If the view is correct that the *Histories* were never published, the argument gains greater force. See the commentary.

Given the uncertainty about publication and, in particular, about the authorship of F1 and F2, the influence of Seneca's historical works is hardly a substantial subject. Griffin rightly scouts the notion of Hahn that his influence can be detected in the work of Florus and Appian and that phraseology in the later authors similar to that of Lucan or the younger Seneca derives from the elder. Hahn concludes: 'si l'on parle ainsi à juste titre d'une philosophie commune du cercle des Sénèque, il n'est pas injustifié non plus de faire remonter les traits communs qui se présentent comme homogénes dans les oeuvres des trois auteurs . . . à l'influence du plus âgé de la gens, Seneca maior . . .'[28] One may well admit the links between the writings of father and

[22] Sussman, *The Elder Seneca* (1978), 144; the wording of T1 seems against so early a date.

[23] Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 10–11.

[24] Klotz, *RhM* 56 (1901), 441–2, claims not only that there is no reason to believe that the younger Seneca published his father's work, but that the passage in question shows that he did not do so; the son had to write the father's biography to ensure his immortality.

[25] Suet. *Claud.* 41.1–2.

[26] Syme, *Tacitus*, 277 n. 4; cf. Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 10, 19, with bibl. of both views.

[27] Schanz–Hosius 2⁴. 341, with bibl. For the elder Seneca, Hahn, *AAntHung* 12 (1964), 174–8, with bibl.

[28] Schanz–Hosius 2⁴. 341, citing Castiglioni, *RFIC* 56 (1928), 454, were already sceptical; however Hahn (*AAntHung* 12 (1964), 174–8 (quotation 178)), following Westerburg (*RhM* 37 (1882), 47–9), argued for Seneca as a source for Florus and Appian. See Griffin, *JRS* 62 (1972), 10 n. 115, and Sussman, *The Elder Seneca* (1978), 138.

son[29] without accepting the pivotal role of the elder Seneca. It is a precarious idea, given the popularity of Lucan himself, the length of the chain of transmission, and, in the case of the main idea of the ages of Rome in F2, its age and wide spread.[30]

(BML)

[29] Peter draws attention to the younger Seneca's use of his father's work, referring to O. Rossbach, *L. Annaeus Florus. P. Annius Florus* (Leipzig, 1896), 66, for details; for such links C. Preisendanz, *De L. Annaei Senecae patris vestigiis in Senecae philosophi scriptis deprehendendis* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1908) is also cited.

[30] Griffin, *Seneca*, 195 n. 2, draws attention to Klotz, *RhM* 56 (1901), 429 42, who suggested an Augustan archetype both for F2 and for Florus 1 *pr.* 4, and for Amm. 14.16.4. In Latin writers she traces it back to Cic. *rep.* 2.3 and 21 and to Livy 2.1. Varro had already been mentioned as the author who systematized the metaphor: B. Riposati, *M. Terenti Varronis de uita populi Romani* (Milan, 1939), 258; F. Vittinghoff, *HZ* 198 (1964), 558 n. 3; Griffin accepts this as plausible.

75

Ti. Claudius Nero Germanicus (Ti. Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus)

Editions: Peter 2. cxviii–cxxiii, 92–4; Jacoby *FGrHist* 276; D. W. Roller, *BNJ* 276.

Principal discussions: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 330–1; A. Gaheis, 'Claudius' (256), *RE* 3 (1897), 2836–7; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 424–6; *PIR*[2] (1936), C 942; Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres* (1940), 125–61; V. M. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940); J. Heurgon, 'La Vocation étruscologique de l'Empereur Claude', *CRAI* 1953, 92–7 (= *Varia Scripta* (Brussels, 1986), 427–32); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 166–7; D. M. Last, R. M. Ogilvie, 'Claudius and Livy', *Latomus* 17 (1958), 476–87; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), esp. 703–10; A. Momigliano, *Claudius: The Emperor and his Achievement* (tr. W. D. Hogarth, Oxford, 1934, 2nd edn., Cambridge, 1961); G. B. Townend, 'Claudius and the digressions in Tacitus', *Rh.M* 105 (1962), 358–68; W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford, 1971); T. J. Cornell, 'Etruscan historiography', *ASNP* Ser. 3, 6 (1976), 411–39; B. M. Levick, 'Antiquarian or revolutionary: Claudius Caesar's conception of his principate', *AJPh* 99 (1978), 79–105; E. Huzar, 'Claudius—the erudite emperor', *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 611–50, esp. 621–6; J. Mottershead (ed.), *Suetonius Claudius*, with introduction and comm. (Bristol, 1986); D. Briquel, 'Que savons-nous des *Tyrrhenica* de l'empereur Claude?', *RFIC* 116 (1988), 448–70; Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle* (1990), 90–2; B. Levick, *Claudius* (London, 1990); R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, at 695–6; J. Malitz, 'Claudius (FGrHist 276)—der Prinzeps als Gelehrter', in V. M. Strocka (ed.), *Die Regierungszeit des Kaisers Claudius* (Mainz, 1994), 133–44; Cornell, *Beginnings* (1995), 130–41; D. W. Hurley, *Suetonius Divus Claudius* (Cambridge, 2001).

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Claudius, born 1 August 10 BC, was the son of the elder Drusus, the future emperor Tiberius' younger brother, and of Antonia Minor. His elder brother was the brilliant Germanicus Caesar, and his sister Livia Julia, wife successively of Gaius Caesar and Drusus Caesar. Claudius' disabilities, evident from childhood and variously diagnosed by modern writers (cerebral palsy, poliomyelitis, premature birth), caused Augustus to fear that he might bring mockery on the imperial family; a disparaging remark of his mother is also quoted (Suet. *Claud.* 3.2). As a result he was denied a public office, except the augurate and two sodalities, and remained an *eques* until

[1] Sources in *PIR*[2] C 942; chronological outlines in Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*, 90–2; see also Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* (1940); Momigliano, *Claudius*[2] (1961); Levick, *Claudius* (1990).

Gaius gave him a suffect consulship for July–September 37. After Gaius' assassination he was declared emperor by the praetorian guard on 24 January 41, and recognized by the senate on the following day. His career as emperor was busy, both in Italy and Rome (*ludi saeculares*, 47 (F1); censorship, 47–8, extension of the Pomerium, 49, construction of harbour at Ostia and aqueducts, draining of the Fucine Lake), and abroad (invasion of Britain, 43). Like his preserved oratory, some of these activities, such as his support for the *haruspices* (Tac. *ann.* 11.15) and extension of the Pomerium (12.23–4), reveal his antiquarian interests (see *Works*).

Coming to power at nearly 50, with his son Britannicus born only just after his accession, Claudius faced problems over his own succession, aggravated by the disgrace of his wife Messalina (48); his attempt to remedy them by marrying Agrippina the Younger the following year and adopting her son L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, Nero, led to factionalism at court and probably hastened his death on 13 October 54; allegedly he was poisoned on the orders of Agrippina. His deification was not taken seriously and his temple was left unfinished for Vespasian to complete.

Works

Claudius was steeped in history and antiquarian studies, and wrote extensively. Speeches, edicts, and letters also survive,[2] some of which use historical material—most notably the so-called Table of Lyons, the inscription recording the speech in which the emperor advocated the admission to the senate of Gauls from Comata.[3] Hence two problems: Claudius' utterances, and perhaps his written works, were exploited by Tacitus and other writers, but without always explicitly giving him the credit or stating what kind of source they were using, so that it is uncertain to what extent Claudius' work is being used (except for the Table of Lyons and the fragments printed here); Townend (*RhM* 105 (1962), 358–68) argues against some of the passages identified by Syme (*Tacitus*, 703–10) as based on Claudius, substituting Aufidius Bassus and Pliny, but the latter certainly used Claudius. Second, it is not clear how far the documentary specimens of Claudius' work are independent of the historical works that must in the main have preceded them.[4] Here they are alluded to only when clearly relevant to known historical works.

Claudius enjoyed the acquaintance of Livy (T1), who survived at least until AD 12 and whose influence has been detected in the language of the Table of Lyons.[5] The influence is played down by Momigliano, who concedes only that Claudius exploited the speech of Canuleius (Livy 4.3–4). At any rate Livy 'encouraged' him to write his Roman history (in this context 'inspiring' would be a forced translation of *hortante*);

[2] Collected in E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* (Cambridge, 1967), nos. 367–76; discussed by Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*, 138–61.

[3] Smallwood, *Docs.* 369 (=*ILS* 212). A version of the speech (of 48) is also presented by Tacitus (*ann.* 11.24), who improves it considerably. For the comparison see esp. M. T. Griffin, *CQ* 32 (1982), 404–18, scathing at 418 on the 'academic *manqué*' or 'narrow civil servant'.

[4] For example, Briquel (*RFIC* 116 (1988), 448–70) is sceptical of the idea that the *Tyrrhenica* was a source for the Table of Lyons.

[5] Momigliano, *Claudius*[2] (1961), 16–19; so too H. M. Last and R. M. Ogilvie, *Latomus* 17 (1958), 476–87.

who the Sulpicius Flavus was who actually helped him (T1) is unknown. Nobody, however, has suggested that Claudius' work was more than mediocre, and Last and Ogilvie (*Latomus* 17 (1958), 467–87) allow him only Livian phraseology.

Claudius tackled his Roman history as an *adulescens*, but perhaps completed it much later, as Mottershead (on Suet. *Claud.* (1986) 41.1–3 = T1) suggests.[6] He began from the death of Julius Caesar in 44 BC. That would have been in the last decade of Augustus' principate, when freedom of speech and writing was being challenged. It is not surprising that he was rebuked by Livia and Antonia, broke off, and recommenced at the end of the civil wars; it has been suggested that *a pace civili* became the title.[7] What might have given offence is uncertain: perhaps an Antonian or even a republican tendency; Claudius celebrated his maternal grandfather's birthday (Suet. *Claud.* 11.3). Momigliano (*Claudius*[2] (1961), 6–7) judges from the *Defence of Cicero against Asinius Gallus* that he was hostile to Antony, but see below. The second phase of the history (cf. F1) would have taken Claudius, at one book to a year, to the death of Augustus; this was the scheme proposed by Bücheler.[8] Momigliano (*Claudius*[2] (1961), 8) refers to the work as 'Annals'; Suetonius calls them *historiae.* There is nothing to be said for Fabia's terminal date of AD 41 (*Sources de Tacite*, 368); it is rebutted by Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*, 128.

The second work mentioned in T1 is the eight-book memoir. It is not to be identified with the *commentarii* of Tac. *ann.* 13.43.3, despite Bardon (*Empereurs et lettres*, 129–30, and *Litt inconnue* 2. 171), who also suggests taking the *commentarii* as rough notes for the autobiography. Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 629) distinguishes *commentarii* from comprehensive autobiography, but Claudius' *commentarii* contained details of criminal cases. This work should have belonged to Claudius' later years, when he had achievements to report.[9] It is described as written *magis inepte quam ineleganter*, that is, it contained incongruous material but had some style (for Claudius' oratorical style see Tac. *ann.* 13.3.2). Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 695) is more far-reaching: the narrative and implied arguments contained material that was ill-suited to claims to imperial dignity and bordered on the ludicrous and absurd. Last and Ogilvie (*Latomus* 17 (1958), 487) interpret the *elegantia* implied here and allowed by Tacitus as a careful choice of words. Claudius' oratory shows that he put effort into his compositions (cf. T2, T3b, d, e), even if the results were clumsy. The lack of propriety is also noticeable in his oratory: he allowed in irrelevant and trivial material (cf. F2–7), a fault that Augustus hinted at when he remarked that Claudius was an effective speaker if he kept to the script (Suet. *Claud.* 4.6). The Table of Lyons shows him committing the fault, notably in his counter-productive attack on Valerius Asiaticus, and aware of it: col. 2. 14–21. The failing was particularly likely to come

[6] Huzar's claim (*ANRW* 2.32.1, 622), that it was published by 43, is not justified by Sen. *dial.* 11 (*cons. ad Pol.*) 8.2, on which she relies.

[7] Malitz in Strocka (ed.), *Regierungszeit* (1994), 137; Hurley, *Suet. Claud.* (2001) on T1).

[8] F. Bücheler, 'Divi Claudii ἀποκολοκύντωσις, *Symbola philologorum Bonnensium in hon. Fr. Ritschelii coll.* 1 (Leipzig, 1864) 48 (= *Kl. Schr.* 1 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1905), 455), accepted by Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 424–5; Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*, 128–9; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3A, *Komm.*, 359.

[9] Augustus wrote his autobiography in his thirties, closing at 25 BC (see Suet. *Aug.* 85 = Augustus 60 T1), but he already had his victory in the civil wars to record, and also needed an *apologia*; Tiberius in the last six years of his eventful life (Suet. *Tib.* 65.1 = Tiberius 73 F1); as Lewis notes (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 696) Claudius had nothing to tell before 41.

out in autobiography. For possible contents of the autobiography see Momigliano (*Claudius*[2] (1961), 8) and Hurley, *Suet. Claud.* (2000) on T1 (material in Suetonius concerning Claudius' early life; cf. F8); Mottershead (Suet. *Claud.* (1986)) on T1 plausibly takes it to Claudius' accession; it may have gone on to the triumph over Britain (44) or, as Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 695) suggests, to the *ludi saeculares* of 47.

The last work mentioned in T1, a defence of Cicero, which Hurley, *Suet. Claud.* (2001), ad loc. suggests may have borne the title *Ciceronis defensio aduersus Asinii Galli libros*, was not a historical work but evidently concerned style: for the dispute see Mottershead (Suet. *Claud.* (1986)), ad loc. It came in for faint praise as *satis erudita*, so it need not tell anything about Claudius' youthful political views.[10] Huzar (*ANRW* 2.32.1, 624) argues that Claudius' concerns were political, and it was likely that he was defending Cicero's career even at the expense of Antony and Octavian; that leaves it unclear what the dispute had to do with Gallus. Hurley, however, suggests that hostility between the emperor Tiberius and Asinius Gallus (which went back to 11 BC) may have stimulated Claudius' attack.

Finally Claudius at uncertain dates wrote two histories in Greek, of the Etruscans and of their some-time allies the Carthaginians (T2); his accomplishment in Greek is discussed by Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*, 126–7. Although Claudius evidently began by writing on almost contemporary Roman history, these Carthaginian and Etruscan works leave no doubt of his interest in the distant past. Syme (*Tacitus*, 514–5 and Appendix 40) lists examples of erudition from Claudian oratory exploited or derided by Seneca and Tacitus; see too Momigliano, *Claudius*[2] (1961), 10, with n. 27, on Claudius' reform of the alphabet in Tac. *ann.* 11.13.2–14: 'His arguments hark back to primitive times and justify their own peculiar reforms by appealing to the inevitable process of evolution.'[11]

What Claudius says in the Table of Lyons is one of the much-discussed sources for the early history of Rome, on which he considered himself an authority, and he claims in the Table to have used *Tusci auctores*. That may have been through Greek and Roman intermediaries: his knowledge of the Etruscan language is disputed (see Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (1971), 27–8, on possible intermediaries), and earlier students are known, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.30.4), A. Caecina, and Tarquitius Priscus, who translated the *Etrusca disciplina* (see Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 28); for other cautious estimates of Claudius' competence see Momigliano, *Claudius*[2] (1961), 9, with n. 22 (on interest in Etruscan matters in the time of Augustus, and enjoining caution on the relationship between Claudius and the bas-relief from Cerveteri representing Vetulonia, Vulci, and Tarquinii);[12] Momigliano concluded that Claudius was making 'an attempt to reconcile the Etruscan story with

[10] But for Pollio and Cicero see Momigliano, *Claudius*[2] (1961), 7; Syme, *HSCPh* 64 (1959) 54=*RP* 1. 429–30.

[11] He claimed that King Servius Tullius was the Etruscan Mastarna (*ILS* 212=Smallwood, *Docs.* 369, col. 1. 18–24, with Momigliano, *Claudius*, 14–16, and, for the Macstrna of the François Tomb at Vulci (*CIE* 5267), F. Coarelli, *DArch* 1–2 (1983), 43–69 (=*Revivit ars*, 138–78), accepting the identification with Servius Tullius as historical; see also M. Pallottino in F. Buranelli (ed.), *La Tomba François de Vulci* (Rome, 1987), 225–33; C. De Simone, *RFIC* 130 (2002), 430–56.

[12] See Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (1971), 11–14; Huzar, *ANRW* 2.32.1, 621–6; Briquel, *RFIC* 116 (1988), 448–70; Malitz in Strocka (ed.), *Regierungszeit* (1994), 139–40.

the Roman story', and that his Etruscan erudition, with all his industry, was confined to collecting the traditions of which remnants survived, or which were mentioned by writers who were easily accessible. However, a more favourable view has been put forward: Heurgon (*CRAI* (1953), 92–7) stressed his Etruscan kinsmen, and A. W. J. Holleman (*Historia* 32 (1984), 504–8) has even claimed Etruscan origin for the Claudii. As to Claudius' scholarship, see Cornell, *ASNP* Ser. 3, 6 (1976), 412–23 and *Beginnings*, 133–4: his view is that in the Table of Lyons Claudius presented his identification of Servius Tullius and Mastarna to his audience as a discovery, even if his sources were existing translations—and there is no trace of this identification in earlier writers—or works translated for him. Claudius' version entails abandoning the Roman story of Servius Tullius, but he noticed the similarities between the stories of the two loyal followers (Servius Tullius the lieutenant of Tarquinius Priscus and Mastarna the companion of Caeles Vibenna) and concluded that they were identical. Claudius may also be credited with the unpopular story that Lars Porsenna captured Rome (Pliny *nat.* 7.138; Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 601–2; Townend, *RhM* 195 (1962), 362 is sceptical). Finally, we may note that A. Grandazzi (*MEFRA* 105 (1993), 508–11) tentatively attributes *POxy* 2088 (=Anonymus 109 in this collection) to Claudius.

(BML, TJC)

76

Ti. Claudius Herma Sideropogon

INTRODUCTION

Ti. Claudius Herma Sideropogon ('Ironbeard'), 'writer of histories', is known from his funerary inscription, a small plaque of white marble (T1). The inscription was found near Rome at a location on the Via Praenestina, 200 m. beyond the eighth milestone, and is now on display in Room 1 of the Epigraphic Collection of the Museo Nazionale Romano. Herma's *praenomen* and *nomen* show that he was probably a freedman of the emperor Claudius. The funerary urn of another cultivated freedman of Claudius was found at the same location, namely the doctor Ti. Claudius Athenodorus Melito (*AE* 1941.64). The historian may be the same man as the *aedituus* Ti. Claudius Herma, who was one of the dedicators of a statue of Silvanus (*ILS* 3533), and (before his manumission) as the emperor's slave Herma, known from the funerary inscription of his own slave Andronicus (*ILS* 3969). We can only speculate as to the nature of Herma's historiographical activity. It is a tempting conjecture that, in addition to his own work, he may have assisted his imperial master in his historical enterprises. See now G. L. Gregori in R. Friggeri, M. G. Granino Cecere, G. L. Gregori, *Terme di Diocleziano: la collezione epigrafica* (Milan, 2012), 32 (with photograph).

(JWR)

77

Julia Agrippina Claudi (Agrippina Minor)

Editions: Peter 2. cxxiii, 94; Motzo, *Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (1927), 56–7.

Principal discussions: R. Raffay, *Die Memoiren der Kaiserin Agrippina* (Vienna, 1884); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893); C. Lackeit, J. Hasebroek, 'Iulia (556) Agrippina', *RE* 10 (1917), 909–16; B. R. Motzo, 'I commentari di Agrippina madre di Nerone', in *Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (Cagliari, 1927), 19–57 (fragments, 56–7); Schanz-Hosius 2[4] (1935), 430; L. Petersen, *PIR*[2] (1966), I 641; E. Paratore, 'La figura di Agrippina minore in Tacito', *Maia* 5 (1952), 32–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 171–2; J. Clack, 'To those who fell on Agrippina's pen', *CW* 69 (1975), 45–53; M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des Femmes sénatoriales* (Brussels, 1984), 426; S. Wood, '*Memoriae Agrippinae*: Agrippina the Elder in Claudian art and propaganda', *AJA* 92 (1988), 409–26; Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle* (1990), 93–4; W. Eck, *Agrippina, die Stadtgründerin Kölns. Eine Frau in der frühzeitlichen Politik* (Cologne, 1993); R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 652–8; A. Barrett, *Agrippina: Mother of Nero* (London, 1996); J. Ginsburg, *Representing Agrippina: Constructions of Female Power in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford, New York, 2006).

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Julia Agrippina, born at Ara Ubiorum (Cologne) in AD 14, 15 (favoured by most scholars), or 16,[2] was the daughter of Germanicus Julius Caesar, adopted son and intended heir of the emperor Tiberius, and of (Vipsania) Agrippina, daughter of Marcus Agrippa and Augustus' daughter Julia. Born to greatness, then, and inevitably aware of it, she was married in 28 to a senator also related to the imperial family, the son of Antonia the Elder, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus[3] (cos. AD 32), and in 37 bore him a son, the later Nero. After a period of disgrace and exile under Gaius in the aftermath of the 'conspiracy' of M. Aemilius Lepidus (39–41), she was restored by Claudius. She then passed to a secondary personage, C. Passienus Crispus[4] (cos. II 44). Close to the emperors Gaius and Claudius as she was, she might still be considered a threat by Claudius' wife Messalina, and it may be that it was for her benefit and even with her connivance that the coup against Messalina was staged in the autumn of 48. Agrippina was soon selected to take Messalina's place, inevitably, when Claudius' prestige was so much reduced by the alleged adultery and treachery of his well-born wife. Marriage to Germanicus' daughter restored his standing, although there was the

[1] See also P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus (no. 82).

[2] Discussion in Barrett, *Agrippina* (1996), 230–2; bibl. in Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*, 94.

[3] *PIR*[2] D (1943), 127. [4] *PIR*[2] P (1998), 146.

boundary of the incest ban to overcome first. Once the marriage was legalized and the ceremony gone through in 49, Agrippina, who became Augusta in 50,[5] did all she could to promote the interests of her son Nero against those of Claudius' natural son Britannicus; he was adopted and took over when Claudius died on 13 October 54 (whether Agrippina poisoned Claudius is dubious). At first she was offered high distinctions, but Nero's advisers Sex. Afranius Burrus and L. Annaeus Seneca the Younger warned him against her policy of following Claudius' autocratic style of government, and her power waned. She took up with possible rivals of Nero, Britannicus and perhaps Rubellius Plautus; and in mid-March 59 Nero had her murdered in her villa on the Bay of Naples.[6] She suffered *damnatio memoriae*.[7]

Work

Agrippina is known to have composed only one work, her memoirs (*Commentarii*, F1), which also took in what happened to her family. They are of uncertain date.[8] Several have argued for Claudius' reign.[9] Peter held that they were written after her marriage to Claudius, to help her plan to bring Nero to power, and enabled her to threaten Nero when he began to cast her off.[10] But exposés do not need literary art. The period of her political decline (55–9), when she might be less in public, is perhaps more attractive, though Peter argues both that she was too cautious to write against her son as emperor and that he would have had the manuscript destroyed.[11] Self-advertisement with no denigration of Nero is credible then, especially in the first years.

As to the content, Agrippina is likely to have begun with her famous Augustan ancestors (above, and including Germanicus' father Nero Drusus). All but Agrippa were victims and would fit the scenario that Tacitus seems to imply with his word *casus*. No doubt she continued until the accession of Nero (or, on Peter's view, his adoption in 51).

Want of specific references makes it uncertain how far the *Commentarii* were a source for extant and other works; but this has not stopped speculation.[12] They will

[5] Tac. *ann.* 12.26. [6] For discussion of the date and place, see Barrett, *Agrippina* (1996), 244–6.

[7] Tac. *ann.* 14.12.1.

[8] See Barrett, *Agrippina* (1996), 198. Eck (*Agrippina* (1993), 22, with n. 52) argues for the period of her first exile.

[9] Barrett (*Agrippina* (1996), 198 n. 9) cites Motzo (*Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (1927), 52), Bardon (*Litt. inconnue*, 2. 172), and others.

[10] Peter 2. cxxiii, citing Tac. *ann.* 13.14.3. On the authenticity of this passage see Barrett, *Agrippina* (1996), 169.

[11] Barrett (*Agrippina* (1996), 198 n. 10) cites Raffay (*Die Memoiren* (1884), 45), Fabia (*Sources de Tacite*, 331), and others.

[12] Peter damns speculation by Raffay on the content, and rejects both the view that Tacitus' account of the death of Germanicus came from the memoirs and Mommsen's inclusion (*Sitzungsberichte der Pr. Akad. der Wiss.* 39 (1904), 1155) of the story of her mother's encounter with Tiberius at a sacrifice to Augustus (Tac. *ann.* 4.52–3; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 53.1). See Barrett, *Agrippina* (1996), 199, for the range of views, with nn. 13–15: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, is very conservative. Motzo (*Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (1927), 19, 22–53) thinks of a multi-volume work, much used by Tacitus for the Tiberian books, and by the elder Pliny (for Suet. *Nero* 6, at 54–5 and 56, see comm. on F2); his arguments for its emergence in Dio are implausible; Paratore (*Maia* 5 (1952), 41–2) has Tacitus using the memoirs for the rise of Nero to the principate. Clack (*CJ* 69 (1975), 45–53) regards them as the source of a number of titbits in Juvenal (scandal about Messalina; Berenice's incest, etc.; only the first is plausible).

have been read by historians and biographers, but there were regular sources for significant political events, so it is safer not to suppose much reliance on them by Tacitus, who makes a special point of mentioning them for one item, and Suetonius.[13] Certainly Tacitus' introduction of the elder Agrippina did not come from them (*ann.* 1.33.5: *paulo commotior*; *indomitum animum*). However, Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 657, noting verbal idiosyncrasies, is inclined to believe that Tacitus may have drawn on them for Agrippina's speeches, as at *ann.* 12.20–1. Given Pliny's use of the memoirs (T1; F2), the inclusion of other medical information from them is possible, but other sources for such items can easily be imagined.[14]

(BML)

[13] So Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 332–3.

[14] Motzo (*Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (1927), 56) and M. T. Griffin (*Nero: The End of a Dynasty* (London, 1984), 23) suggest that *nat.* 7.71, on Agrippina's double right canine, came from the memoirs. This is plausible, but not certain; the subject seems trivial, though consistent with the self-advertisement of the memoirs. Motzo also includes Suet. *Nero* 6, the flattering comment on Nero's birth *exoriente sole paene ut radiis prius quam terra contingeretur*, along with the story of Messalina's attempt to murder the child.

78

Aufidius Bassus

Editions: Peter 2. cxxv–cxvii, 96–8.

Principal discussions: W. Harless, *De Fabiis et Aufidiis* (Bonn, 1853), 45–52; T. Mommsen, 'Die Chronik des Cassiodorus Senator vom. J. 519 n.Chr.' (1861), in *Ges. Schr.* 7 (Berlin, 1909), 677–9; K. Nipperdey, 'An Theodor Mommsen', *RhM* 17 (1862), 438–42 (=*Opuscula* (Berlin, 1877), 436–9); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893); P. v. Rohden, 'Aufidius (15) Bassus', *RE* 2 (1896), 2290–1; W. Pelka, 'Zu Aufidius Bassus', *RhM* 61 (1906), 620–4; F. Münzer, 'Aufidius und Plinius', *RhM* 62 (1907), 161–9; K. Nipperdey (ed.), *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Ab excessu Divi Aug. I–VI* (11th edn., rev. G. Andresen, Berlin, 1915); *XI–XVI* (6th edn., 1908); B. R. Motzo, *Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (Cagliari, 1927), 58–61; A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} A (1933), 1381; F. A. Marx, 'Die Quellen der Germanenkriege bei Tacitus und Dio', *Klio* 26 (1933), 323–9; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 644–6; F. A. Marx, 'Die Überlieferung der Germanenkriege, bes. d. Aug. Zeit (Velleius u. Dio)', *Klio* 29 (1936), 204–18; F. A. Marx, 'Aufidius Bassus', *Klio* 29 (1936), 94–101; C. Jodry, 'L'Utilisation des documents militaires chez Velleius Paterculus', *REL* 29 (1951), 265–84; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 164–6; F. Klingner, 'Tacitus und die Geschichtsschreiber des 1. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.', *MH* 15 (1958), 194–205 (=*Röm. Geisteswelt*^{4} (1961), 469–89); Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 274–5, 288, 697–700; G. B. Townend, 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48; R. Syme, 'The historian Servilius Nonianus', *Hermes* 82 (1964), 408 24 (=*Ten Studies in Tacitus* (Oxford, 1970), 91–109); D. Timpe, *Der Triumph des Germanicus* (Bonn, 1968), 8–23; Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus* (1979), 257–8; R. Syme, 'The year 33 in Tacitus and Dio', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 93–123 (=*RP* 4 (1988), 223 44); Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984), 565–9; 78–82; N. Matthieu, *Histoire d'un nom: les Aufidii dans la vie politique, économique et sociale du monde romain* (Rennes, 1999).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Bassus was not the only intellectual Aufidius: law, medicine, and history (Cn. Aufidius, no. 17) are cited among their activities.[1] A possible forbear is L. Aufidius L. f. Bassus, honoured by the people of Tenos (*IG* 12.5.860, not long before Pompey's campaign against the pirates, 67 BC); otherwise Bassus' connection with republican Aufidii is uncertain.

Bassus was a 'slightly earlier writer' than Servilius Nonianus (cos. AD 35), born *c.*3–1 (T4).[2] He suffered chronic infirmities (T2); there is no evidence of membership of the senate.[3] The infirmities led Stein (*PIR*^{2} A (1933), 1381) to suggest that he

[1] Harless, *De Fabiis et Aufidiis* (1853), 45.

[2] Syme, *RP* 3. 1017, suggested *c.*5 BC as the year of birth; Harless gave him a score of years more.

[3] *Pace* Marx, *Klio* 26 (1936), 100; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 166, regarded him as belonging to the 'opposition'.

might be the L. Aufidius Bassus who made a dedication to Aesculapius and Valetudo in the Asclepieion at Athens perhaps in AD 41 (T1).

The younger Seneca, a friend (T2), says that Bassus endured his infirmities courageously into old age, to a point where it was time to think of getting out.[4] Bassus was of a philosophical (Epicurean) disposition, keeping his mind keen (3, 14).[5] The passage, dating to spring 64,[6] seems to present Aufidius as being at death's door; it may be a veiled obituary notice.

Works

Aufidius wrote a *Bellum Germanicum* and a history of his own times (T2).[7] If the *Bellum* is a preliminary monograph comparable to those of Sallust and Tacitus,[8] it probably belongs to the reign of Tiberius. There is little reason to suppose it a full account, including the struggle with Ariovistus or even the Cimbric War, as Nipperdey held.[9] Reference to a (singular) *Bellum*, (in more than one book), suggests that the work included the achievements of Germanicus, who was judged to have brought the war to an end.[10] The elder Pliny claimed to have been prompted by Nero Drusus to write his own account; Drusus appeared to him in a dream to ask him to rescue his reputation. Timpe's thesis was that the *Bellum* comprised the campaigns of 10–16,[11] but Syme's point that a work limited to the campaigns of Germanicus would not have been written under Tiberius is strong, to be met only if it were commemorative, an expansion of *res gestae* celebrated in the *Tabula Siarensis* of AD 20.[12] If Aufidius completed his work under Tiberius, while Pliny wrote under Claudius Caesar, Drusus' son,[13] the former might include the campaigns both of Nero Drusus and especially of Tiberius, while the latter would stress those of Germanicus and Drusus (at the expense of Tiberius').

Opening and closing dates of the main history are uncertain. Aufidius mentions the death of Cicero (F1) and, if part of the history, that suggests that he began with the civil wars.[14] The possibility that the description belongs to another monograph

[4] The friendship between Aufidius and Seneca suggested to Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 232, that the introduction of Seneca in Dio 59.19.7, under the year 39, is from Aufidius: other references are less friendly. However, the attribution remains uncertain: see Griffin, *Seneca*, 429 n. 2.

[5] As Münzer (*RhM* 62 (1907), 162) insists, he would have been *capable* of writing under Claudius.

[6] Griffin, *Seneca*, 400, 518.

[7] Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.* 7. 677–9 and *Chron. min.* 2, *praef.* 112, followed by von Rohden, *RE* 2. 2290) continued to hold the *Bellum* a section of the general history.

[8] So Syme, *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 9.

[9] Nipperdey, *RhM* 17 (1862), 439.

[10] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 407; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 165, includes campaigns of Tiberius, Drusus, and Germanicus.

[11] Pliny *epist.* 3.5.4. Timpe, *Triumph des Germanicus* (1968), 12–15, followed by Pelling, *OCD*[4] 204; cf. also H. Smilda, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii* (Groningen, 1895), 191, asserting limits of AD 9–16, and C. A. Knabe, *De Fontibus Hist. Imperat. Jul.* (Diss. Halle, 1864), 22; Syme takes the starting point back to AD 4 (*RP* 3. 1026), omitting the successes of both Drusus and the young Tiberius.

[12] *Roman Statutes* 37. lines 13–15.

[13] Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 337; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 166; Gaius in the view of Pelka, *RhM* 61 (1906), 624 and Peter 2. cxxvi.

[14] Peter 2. cxxvi, supported by Noé, *Storiografia imperiale*, 79; *ab excessu Divi Caesaris*, as suggested by von Rohden, *RE* 2. 2291, accepted by Syme, *Tacitus*, 275, 698, or the proscriptions themselves, Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 165, and Matthieu, *Histoire d'un nom* (1999), 249 n. 35.

(the last year of Cicero's life) was mooted by Syme, suggesting that the history took up where Livy left off, in 8 BC.[15] That would give greater poignancy to Tacitus' charge of partiality against those who followed the *decora ingenia* of Augustan writers, but the other works discussed by Seneca (*suas.* 6.18–25) are annalistic histories, and the feebleness of making 8 BC a starting point, perhaps after a section doing little more than recount the German and Balkan wars, is against it.

As to the termination, Cassiodorus' claim (F4) to have derived his information on events that fell between the end of Livy (in 9 BC) and AD 32, when he turns to the *Cursus paschalis* of Victorius of Aquitaine, from Aufidius, provides a *terminus post quem*.[16] Again, Pliny's history began *A fine Aufidi Bassi* (T3a, b) and Pliny emerges in Tacitus' *Annals* as a source in 55 (Tac. *ann.* 13. 20. 3=F5 Peter). Scholars have opted for the death of an emperor;[17] most admit that the end of a history that left Pliny no better a designation should not coincide with a change of ruler.[18] The year 50 was advocated by Fabia and Münzer for the beginning of Pliny.[19]

The history might have reached Sejanus' death and become available for the elder Seneca to hear soon afterwards.[20] Later dates have been proposed, but the arguments are inconclusive.[21] Aufidius' work was known to the elder Seneca in whole or part as an established history when he was writing the *Suasoriae* (F1 f), and if the narrative

[15] *Tacitus*, 698; *Hermes* 82 (1964), 418, followed by F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 84; rejected by Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 258; Klingner, *Röm. Geisteswelt*[4], 474, also includes the death of Cicero within the history. Motzo, *Studi di storia e filologia* 1 (1927), 58, surveying earlier writers, argues for limited scope.

[16] See Klingner, *Röm. Geisteswelt*[4], 474. Münzer, *RhM* 62 (1907), 162–3, warns of the danger of assuming that a terminus is indicated when there is no evidence that a later author used his history, or ceased to do so at a certain point.

[17] Tiberius (von Rohden, *RE* 2. 2291, hesitantly) or Gaius (H. Christensen, *De Fontibus a Cassio Dione in vita Neronis narranda adhibitis* (Berlin, 1871), 61; D. Detlefsen, *Philologus* 34 (1876), 48; Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 5, 357, adducing the thirty-one books of Pliny's history, which seems to have ended in 71) or even Claudius (L. Urlichs, *Chrestomathia Pliniana* (Berlin, 1857), xii).

[18] W. Sickel, *De Fontibus a Cassio Dione in conscr. rebus inde a Tiberio usque ad mortem Vitellii gestis adhibitis* (Göttingen, 1876), 36 n. 5; Pelka, *RhM* 61 (1906), 622–3; Syme, *Tacitus*, 89, 698; Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 233; but, as Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 80, indicates, Pliny may have chosen this title to draw attention to his emulation of Aufidius' status.

[19] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 186–9; Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 78 n. 1.

[20] So Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* 7. 677–9; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 189–90; Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 5. 357–8; Pelka, *RhM* 61 (1906), 620–4; Cichorius, *RS* 414; Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 337; Peter 2. cxxvi; Syme, *Athenaeum* 77 (1989), 271.

[21] Sickel, *De fontibus* (cit. n. 18), 36–7: AD 44; Syme, *Tacitus*, 288–9, 697–700, followed by Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 230: after Gaius' death, not later than 47 (*Plinius et Clavius*, Tac. *ann.* 13.20.3, must have been referred to more formally in the lost books). A fragile argument is put forward by Townend that the transition from Aufidius to Pliny comes between two campaigns in which Cn. Hosidius Geta took part: in Mauretania at the end of Gaius' reign and in Britain in 43 (Dio 60.9.1 and 20.4). Discretion as a motive for stopping is adduced by Syme, *Hermes* 82 (1964), 419, if not before the rebellion of Camillus Scribonianus in 42, then at the invasion of Britain in the following year or at Claudius' censorship, 47, in which Rome achieved her eighth century. Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 814, believed that Tacitus was using Aufidius up to the trial of Valerius Asiaticus in 47. Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 188, 360 takes not long before the accession of Nero as the closure, followed by Münzer, *RhM* 62 (1907), 161–9. Münzer used traces of Pliny's work in the *Annals*, including the beginning of systematic reporting of prodigies noticed by Nipperdey–Andresen (1915), 28, and found the boundary between Aufidius and Pliny after Claudius' censorship in the period 1 Jan. 49–1 Jan. 52, with the victory parade over Caratacus derived from Pliny's eyewitness account. Pliny's interest in portents: *nat.* 2.199 and 232 (but cf. Griffin, *Seneca*, 429). A. E. Egger, *Examen critique des historiens anciens de la vie et du règne d'Auguste* (Paris, 1844), 172, Nipperdey, *RhM* 17 (1862), 438, and Peter, *Gesch. Litt.* 2. 39, go to 54; Pliny's title is against them.

went no further than 31 it may have been in circulation before Tiberius' death. Otherwise it must have come out in instalments.

Something of Aufidius' annalistic style may be gauged from T2 and F1–2. His view of Cicero's policy towards Antony is striking (F2), and he gives a favourable impression of Tiberius' achievements in 8 BC (F4). This suggests publication before Tiberius' death, making Aufidius' one of the accounts vulnerable to Tacitus' charge, *ann.* 1.1.2, *ob metum falsae*. Publication after Tiberius' death would make it likely to be the first hostile account of his reign and influential in establishing the tradition, and equally liable to stricture: *recentioribus odiis compositae*.[22]

Lauded by Quintilian (T4, GT5) as historians to be studied for *eloquentia*, Aufidius and Servilius Nonianus are also singled out for that quality in Tacitus' *Dialogus* (T3). Aufidius' highly regarded work, admitted to Quintilian's canon of imperial historians, continued by Pliny, remained available as a high-status authority until the time of Cassiodorus (F4). It must have been known to Tacitus and Dio, although he is not mentioned in their histories, and only once by the elder Pliny in his extant work (T3). Scholars take it for a main source for their accounts of the Augustan and early Julio-Claudian periods.[23] It has been argued that the brevity of Dio's account of the German wars, apart from the Varian disaster, shows that Dio was using Aufidius' history, the topic having been dealt with fully in the *Bellum*; but the thin texture has also been put down to Dio's own selection of material;[24] Tacitus may have used the *Bellum* for his account of Germanicus' campaigns.[25] Aufidius' claim to be a source for part of the *Annals* is generally accepted, though Syme looks to Servilius Nonianus.[26] Some evidence is fragile, if ingenious.[27] On the whole, except perhaps implicitly by Tacitus (*ann.* 1. 1. 5), his claim to high status seems to have been allowed.

(BML)

[22] Cf. A. Dihle, *RhM* 94 (1971), 27–43, for Epicurean impartiality; *contra* Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 78 n. 1.

[23] Marx, *Klio* 26 (1933), 323–9 (so Syme, *Tacitus*, 697, but with caution in *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 10 (= *RP* 4. 231), urging the possibility of an *ignotus*) held Aufidius to be a source (hostile to Tiberius) used by Dio for Augustus. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 258, rejects E. Gabba's suggestion (*RSI* 67 (1955), 289–333) that a new source, Bassus, began with 53.19.

[24] Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus*, 258; J. W. Rich, *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement* (Warminster, 1990), 17.

[25] Syme, *RP* 3. 1026.

[26] *Annals*: Harless, *De Fabiis et Aufidiis* (1853), 51; esp. Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 397, 407; Nonianus: Syme, *Hermes* 82 (1964), 419.

[27] Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 240 n. 4, observed that when the consulship of the future emperor Galba (AD 33) is mentioned in Tac. *ann.* 6.14.1 and Dio 58.20.5, he is called Servius Galba; contemporary documents style him Lucius. He asks if he had reverted to his original *praenomen* when Aufidius was writing.

79

M. Servilius Nonianus

Editions: Peter 2. cxxviii–cxxviii, 98.

Principal discussions: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893); H. Dessau, *PIR* (1898), S 420; K. Nipperdey (ed.), *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Ab excessu Divi Augusti I–VI* (11th edn., rev. G. Andresen, Berlin, 1915); *XI–XVI* (6th edn., 1908); A. Klotz, 'M. Servilius (69) Nonianus', *RE* 2A (1923), 1802; E. Westermayer, 'M. Servilius (69) Nonianus', *RE* Suppbd. 2 (1935), 819; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 629, 631, 646; Bardon, *Lit. inconnue* 2 (1956), 167; F. Klingner, 'Tacitus und die Geschichtsschreibung des 1 Jahrhunderts', *MH* 15 (1958), 194–206 (= *Röm. Geisteswelt*[4] (1961), 469–89); R. Syme, 'Obituaries in Tacitus', *AJPh* 79 (1958), 18–31 (= *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (1970), 79–90); Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 275–7; Syme, 'The historian Servilius Nonianus', *Hermes* 82 (1964), 408–24 (= *Ten Studies*, 91–109); Syme, *Historiographia antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in hon. W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Louvain, 1977), 235 (= *RP* 3 (1984), 1017); Syme, 'Minor emendation in Pliny and Tacitus', *CQ* 30 (1980), 426–8 (= *RP* 3 (1984), 1233–5); Syme, 'The year 33 in Tacitus and Dio', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 93–123 (= *RP* 4 (1988), 223–44); H. Fuchs, 'Tacitus' Nachruf auf Servilius Nonianus', *MH* 22 (1965), 115–16; H. Aigner, 'Servilius Nonianus cos. 35 n.Chr.: ein Servilius oder ein Nonius?', *Historia* 21 (1972), 507–12; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984), 79–84; O. Devillers, 'La Composante biographique dans l' historiographie romaine impériale avant Tacite', in G. Lachenaud, D. Longrée (eds.), *Grecs et romains aux prises de l'histoire* (Rennes, 2003), 2. 606–19.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The family of Servilius Nonianus was put on show by Dessau and Syme. He was the son of M. Servilius (cos. AD 3), and on his father's side grandson of the republican M. Servilius, tribune of the plebs in 43 BC, on his mother's of Nonius, a senator proscribed by Antony;[1] earlier collateral forebears included P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus (cos. 79 BC), but Nonianus' branch had not held consular *fasces* since 202 BC.[2] M. Servilius the consul of AD 3 probably married a Considia, renewing connections with the Nonii, and their daughter (Servilia) Considia (Plin. *nat.* 24.43) became the wife of Barea Soranus, suff. 52, the Stoic martyr of 65 (along with his daughter Servilia).[3]

[1] Aigner (*Historia* 21 (1972), 507–12) suggests the adoption of the consul of AD 3 by a Nonius as an alternative source of the nomenclature, but note O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (Helsinki, 1992), 61 n. 2 and 85; Salomies argues that a name ending *-ianus* under the republic may have come from the mother (he does not cite examples), and under the empire more often does.

[2] See Münzer's stemma, *RE* Suppl. 2. 1777–8.

[3] Servilia: Tac. *ann.* 16.30.2–31.3; 33.2. Münzer (*Beiträge . . . Plinius*, 404–5) argued that passages from the elder Pliny suggesting intimacy with Nonianus (*nat.* 24.43; 28.29; 37.81) were taken from his *Annales*.

Born *c.*3–1 BC, Nonianus entered the senate as quaestor in about AD 24. These dates are inferred from that of his consulship; he was *ordinarius* in 35 and probably went on to a proconsulship of Africa as the pinnacle of the senatorial career in about AD 47 (*AE* (1932), 24). He was regarded as one of the leading men in the state (*princeps ciuitatis*: Plin. *nat.* 28.29). He was cultivated 'as a father' by the Stoic poet and friend of Thrasea Paetus, Persius Flaccus (T5); the connection with Nonianus is also suggested by the dedication of Persius' second Satire to a pupil of his (*Schol.* on *sat.* 2.1). In all likelihood, then, Nonianus was of the Stoic persuasion (Klingner, *Röm. Geisteswelt*[4], 479); that added stature to his work; but there is no evidence that he took part in any activities that could be ascribed to Bardon's 'opposition sénatoriale' (*Litt. inconnue* 2. 167). The year of Servilius' death, 59, is known from T3, on which see Syme, *AJPh* 79 (1958), 23.

Works

Servilius came to history after he had ended his 'long' forensic career, perhaps, as Syme suggests, after his proconsulship. It is possible, then, that the recital gate-crashed by the emperor Claudius was from Servilius' history, and Quintilian, born *c.*35, may also record a recital from that rather than a rhetorical declamation (T4, T1).

The elder Pliny was probably acquainted with Servilius (see n. 3); the information about him is intimate, but includes passages from his work, which would in that case have stretched back as far as the civil wars, since it would have included the proscription of his grandfather Nonius (Plin. *nat.* 37.81).[4]

Servilius' *Annales* (F2) made him famous and M. Aper in the *Dialogus* (T2) couples him with Aufidius as an example of contemporary eloquence. Quintilian, who had actually heard him, does the same (T1), though suggesting a Livian rather than a Sallustian writer, with the failings of the practised speaker (Syme, *Hermes* 82 (1964), 418).

In spite of his distinction no one cites Servilius' *Annals* by author and title, although it has been received opinion[5] that Tacitus cannot have failed to use him in writing the *Annals*; he would then be one of the authors whom Tacitus accuses (*ann.* 1.1.4) of writing with *ira et studium* of dead or living emperors. The content and scope of the work are uncertain, but Syme argued[6] that it would appeal to Tacitus more than that of Aufidius: a senator and man of affairs, Servilius would have had access to revelatory details (and did not disdain anecdote and scandal). His father, the consul of AD 3, is indeed introduced into Tacitus' version of the prosecution of Aemilia Lepida (Tac. *ann.* 3.22–3; cf. 2.48.2).[7] It is an unchallenged view that

However, it is unlikely that the work had the scope for this story, which also contains elements that are unfavourable to the Nonii, and in any case is self-refuting (Nonius had other substantial properties worth a proscription). A source other than Servilius would be preferable.

[4] Syme, *Hermes* 82 (1964), 419, mooted the death of Augustus as the starting point (an example to Tacitus), or the aftermath of Actium, or AD 4, pressing the advantages of that year and the adoption of Tiberius as an introduction to his reign.

[5] Since Nipperdey–Andresen, *Tacitus* (1915), 30; Schanz–Hosius 2[4], 337–8, and Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 365–7.

[6] Syme, *Hermes* 82 (1964), 419–20; *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 9.

[7] *Ann.* 6.1–7, on eastern affairs, is traced back to Servilius by Syme, *AClass.* 30 (1987), 60 (= *RP* 6 (1991), 284), since on his view Aufidius ended with the events of 31.

Servilius' work is the one cited anonymously by Suetonius in his biography of Tiberius, with no credit to that princeps (F2), although Tiberius had bent the law to sustain his father's fortunes (Tac. *ann.* 2.48.1).[8]

(BML)

[8] Syme suggests that it, rather than the work of Cluvius Rufus, lies behind Josephus' account of the assassination of Gaius and its aftermath (*AJ* 19.1–273); but see T. P. Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus, Death of an Emperor* (Exeter, 1991), xii–xiv. Syme also notes (*Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 9) that Tacitus has recourse to the *Memoirs* of the younger Agrippina in 4.53.2, a source not available to Nonianus (thus supplementing him).

80

C. Plinius Secundus

Editions: Peter 2. cxxxxvi–clxii, 109–12.

Principal discussions: K. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2 (Berlin, 1887); H. Nissen, 'Die Historien des Plinius', *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548; D. Detlefsen, 'Über des älteren Plinius Geschichte seiner Zeit und ihr Verhältnisse zum Tacitus', *Philologus* 34 (1876), 40–9; T. Mommsen, 'Die Familie des Germanicus', *Hermes* 13 (1878), 245–65 (=*Ges. Schr.* 4 (1906), 271–90); T. Mommsen, 'Eine Inschrift des Älteren Plinius', *Hermes* 19 (1884), 644–8; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 169–259, 317, 389–400; A. Gercke, 'Seneca Studien. II. Hist.-biographische Untersuchungen über Seneca u. seine Zeit', *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 159–252; E. Groag, 'Zur Kritik von Tacitus' Quellen in den Historien', *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 709–98, esp. 777–85; P. von Rohden, *PIR* P (1897), 373; F. Münzer, 'Die Quelle des Tacitus für die Germanenkriege', *BJ* 104 (1899), 67–111; F. Münzer, 'Aufidius und Plinius', *RhM* 62 (1907), 161–9; E. Wölfflin, 'Plinius und Cluvius Rufus', *ALL* 12 (1907), 345–54; K. Nipperdey (ed.), *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Ab excessu Divi Aug. I–VI* (11th edn., rev. G. Andresen, Berlin, 1915); *XI–XVI* (6th edn., 1908); E. G. Hardy, 'Plutarch, Tacitus, and Suetonius, on Galba and Otho', in *Studies in Roman History* 1 (Oxford, 1910), 294–333, esp. 327–9; M. Lehnerdt, 'Ein verschollenes Werk des älteren Plinius', *Hermes* 48 (1913), 274–82; E. Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), 387–434; Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), esp. 423–5; A. Momigliano, 'Osservazioni sulle fonte per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone', *RAL* ser. 6, 8 (1932), 293–336 (=*Quinto contributo* (1975), 799–836); F. A. Marx, 'Die Quellen der Germanenkriege bei Tacitus und Dio', *Klio* 26 (1933), 323–9; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), esp. 629–31, 980–1; F. A. Marx, 'Aufidius Bassus', *Klio* 29 (1936), 94–101; F. A. Marx, 'Die Überlieferung der Germanenkriege, bes. der Augusteischen Zeit (Velleius u. Dio)', *Klio* 29 (1936), 202–18; W. Otto, 'Zur Lebenszeit des C. Plinius Secundus', *Philologus* 90 (1935), 483–94; Ch. Nailis, 'Studie over de chronologie van het leven en de werken van Plinius den Naturalist', *PhS* 13/14 (1942/3), 1–23, 65–78; K. Ziegler *et al.*, 'C. Plinius (5) Secundus der Ältere', *RE* 21 (1951), 271–439 (Life: K. Ziegler, 271–85; *Life of Pomponius*: W. Kroll, 285; *German Wars*: H. Gundel, 285–9; *Histories*: H. Gundel, 289–93); R. Nierhaus, 'Zu den ethnographische Angabe in Lukans Gallischen Excurs', *BJ* 153 (1953), 46–52; K. Meister, 'Der Bericht des Tacitus über die Landung des Germanicus in der Emsmündung', *Hermes* 83 (1955), 92–106; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 129 f., 161, 165, 169; R. Syme, 'Deux proconsulats d'Afrique', *REA* 58 (1956), 236–40; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), esp. 60–3, 179–81, 288–94; E. Norden, 'Auf den Spuren des Bella Germanica des Plinius', in *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus' Germania* (4th edn., Darmstadt, 1959), 207–312; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (Paris, 1960), 106–11, no. 45; G. B. Townend, 'Some rhetorical battle-speeches', *Hermes* 89 (1960), 98–120; G. B. Townend, 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48; G. B. Townend, 'The reputation of Verginius Rufus', *Latomus* 20 (1961), 337–40; Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales*[2] (1963), esp. 84–91, 204–19, 315–17; R. Hanslik, 'Plinius der Älterer', *AAHG* 17 (1964), 65–80, esp. 65–7; G. B. Townend, 'Cluvius Rufus in the "Histories" of Tacitus', *AJPh* 85 (1964), 337–77; J. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher in den Annalen des Tacitus* (Heidelberg, 1965), esp. 58–9; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 219–21; D. Timpe, *Der Triumph des Germanicus* (Bonn, 1968), 8–23; R. Syme, 'Pliny the procurator', *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 201–36 (= *RP* 2 (1979), 742–73); K. Sallmann, 'Plinius der Ältere 1938–70', *Lustrum* 18 (1975), 1–299, esp. 8–18,

22–25; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976), esp. 427–40; L. Braccesi, 'Plinio storico', in L.Alfonsi and A. Ronconi (eds.), *Plinio il Vecchio* (Como, 1982), 53–82; F. Römer, 'Plinius der Ältere', *AAHG* 31 (1982), 129–206; A. Mehl, 'Kaiser Claudius und der Feldherr Corbulo bei Tacitus und Dio: ist der Ältere Plinius die Quelle beide Autoren?', *Hermes* 107 (1979), 220–39; M. Sage, 'The *De Viris Illustribus*: authorship and date', *Hermes* 108 (1980), 83–100, esp. 86–92; G. B. Townend, 'Tacitus, Suetonius, and the temple of Janus', *Hermes* 108 (1980), 233–42; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984), esp. 120–40; K. Sallmann, 'Der Traum des Historikers: zu den "Bella Germanica" des Plinius und zur julisch-claudischen Geschichtsschreibung', *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 578–601; C. Serbat, 'Pline l'Ancien. État présent des études sur sa vie, son oeuvre et son influence 1945–84', *ANRW* 2.32.4 (1984), 2069–200, esp. 2071–9; D. W. Hurley, 'Gaius Caligula in the Germanicus tradition', *AJPh* 110 (1989), 316–38; M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford, 1992); R. Syme, 'Consular friends of the elder Pliny', *RP* 7 (1991), 496–511; G. Winkler, *PIR*^{2} P (1998), 493; J. B. Rives, *Tacitus Germania* (Oxford, 1999), esp. 36–7; R. K. Gibson, R. Morello (eds.), *Pliny the Elder* (Leiden, 2011).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Our knowledge of Pliny's life comes from references in his own works, the writings of his nephew the younger Pliny, and Suetonius' *Vita*. T1 is a letter of uncertain date, three to four years after the younger Pliny's consulship in September 100 (Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 31); its addressee, Baebius Macer (*PIR*^{2} B 20), read Pliny the Elder and expressed a wish to possess all his work. *Epist.* 6.16 gives an account of the Elder's death; then there is the *Vita* of Suetonius (T3). There are also two epigraphic documents: one, a horse-brass from Castra Vetera (Xanten), inscribed *Plinio praef. eq.* ('when Pliny was prefect of cavalry'), is valuable; the other, an inscription from Aradus in Syria that has been used to establish that Pliny served in that province, is too fragmentary to be securely attributed to him.[1] From these materials Münzer constructed a chronology which, though shaken in detail, has stood the test of time.[2] Pliny was born in late 23 or early 24 (cf. T1.7; Pliny *epist.* 6.16.4), a native of Novum Comum (T3), and did his military service in Germany (T1.4). In what order he held the three posts available remains in dispute[3] and matters here only because

[1] Horse-brass: L. Jenkins, *Britannia* 16 (1985), 141–64, esp. 154–5. Mommsen's theory (*Hermes* 19 (1884), 644) of Pliny's service as commander of an Egyptian legion in 70, based on identifying the -νιος Σεκοῦνδος of *OGIS* 586 (from Phoenician Arados) with Pliny, was not accepted by Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 103–6, or by Syme, *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 205; it was viewed more favourably by Ziegler, *RE* 21. 278–80. See further Serbat, *ANRW* 2.32.4, 2074. Nailis concluded (*PhS* 13–14 (1942–3), 76) that 'in 65 of 66 treedt hij opnieuw in staatsdienst. Na een verblijf in het Osten, waar hij zijn latere beschermheeren . . . leert kennen, bekleedt hij verschillende procuratorische ambten, welke met het commando der vloot . . . worden bekroonde. Zijn voornaamste litteraire activiteit valt tusschen 55 en 66' ('In 65 or 66 he was again engaged in public duties. After a stay in the East, where he met his future patrons, . . . he held various procuratorial posts, which were crowned with the command of the Fleet. His main literary activity fell between 55 and 66.')

[2] Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 67–111, followed by Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (1960), 106–11, and Syme, *Tacitus*, 60–1, etc.; cf. Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 216–23.

[3] For discussion of the order of the *militiae*, see H. Devijver, *Prosopographia Militiarum Equestrium* (Leuven, 1970), P 44. 647–8; Syme, *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 205–8; *Helmantica* 38 (1987), 223–31; *RP* 7. 496–501; Serbat, *ANRW* 2.32.4, 2074; Winkler, *PIR*^{2} P 493.

his nephew's chronological catalogue of his works includes the information that he composed his monograph on *The Use of the Javelin in Cavalry Warfare* as prefect of a cavalry *ala* (T1.3), normally the most senior of the posts, but temporarily made a preliminary to the military tribunate by Claudius (Suet. *Claud.* 25.1). He served with Cn. Domitius Corbulo and the Lower Rhine army against the Chauci in 47[4] and continued under another military man, but one even more distinguished as a poet, his close friend (?P. Calvisius) Pomponius Secundus (suff. 44; *PIR*[2] P 754), on the Upper Rhine in 49–50.[5] He was in Italy in 52 (*nat.* 33.63; 36.124), but returned to the Lower Rhine and probably served both with Pompeius Paullinus and with Duvius Avitus, 56/7–58. The metal *phalera* from Vetera seems to establish his command of the *ala* to this term.[6] In Germany Pliny became friendly with Vespasian's son Titus (*nat. pr.* 3–4)[7] and met Cornelius Tacitus, procurator of Belgica (*nat.* 7.76).[8]

Pliny was back in Italy in 59, witnessing the solar eclipse of 30 April (*nat.* 2.180). The last years of Nero's reign produced safe literary studies (T1.5), and Münzer concluded that he was not in employment during those years. An unbroken and distinguished series of procuratorships, in which he won a high reputation for integrity, is assigned to him by Suetonius (T3), dated by Münzer to the period 70 on. These too have been much discussed.[9] Of the series of four postulated by Münzer, only one is firmly established, and the date even of that has been questioned. The first half of Vespasian's reign is very crowded and, as M. T. Griffin has pointed out, there is no evidence for any substantial gap in Pliny's service.[10] She suggests that the first one or two procuratorships might rather be late Neronian. The younger Pliny's account of his uncle's literary career certainly happens to make the reader believe that he was quietly writing on grammar during the last years of Nero's reign, and official activity is linked with his other works, perhaps intentionally.[11] The procuratorship of Narbonensis, assigned to 70, is inferred from the knowledge Pliny shows in the *Natural History*, but that need not have come from a period of service there.[12] Relying on the eyewitness reports that Pliny includes, Münzer found an African procuratorship in 71–2, but that has also been assigned a Neronian date.[13] Pliny certainly served in Tarraconensis (T1.17), in 73–4 according to Münzer; this was at a time when he could have sold his *commentarii* to Larcius Licinus, *legatus iuridicus* (*PIR*[2] I. 95), for HS400,000 (T1.17; cf. *nat.* 19.35; 21.34). But the date again is uncertain, since the

[4] Pliny *epist.* 3.5.3; cf. Tac. *ann.* 11.18–19; cf. *nat.* 16.2.

[5] W. Eck, *Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen* (Cologne, 1985), 20–2.

[6] Syme, *RP* 7. 499, arguing from the details in Tac. *ann.* 13.53–7, suggests that Pliny was on the Lower Rhine from 56 or 55 to 58.

[7] Date of Titus' transfer to Britain: Syme, *RP* 7. 499: 57, 58, or 60.

[8] For this term of service as the occasion, see Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 107; 110; W. Meyers, *L'Administration de la province romaine de Belgique* (Bruges, 1964), 68; Syme, *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 213; *RP* 7. 501.

[9] Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 67–111; Nailis, *PhS* 13–14 (1942–3), 1–23, 65–78; Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (1960), 106–11; Syme, *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 201–36; *RP* 7. 501–5.

[10] Griffin, *Seneca*, 438, citing Pliny the Younger on his uncle's full life from military service onward and his friendship with *principes*.

[11] So Beagon, *Roman Nature* (1992), 3, with n. 8.

[12] See Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 221, with Pliny in Narbonensis in 59; Syme, *Tacitus*, 61 n. 2; *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 212–13; cf. *RP* 7. 503, noting that Ziegler, *RE* 21. 277, accepts only Tarraconensis.

[13] Syme, *REA* 58 (1956), 236–40; *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 214–5. In *RP* 7. 502–3 he proposes 59, following Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 221; so Beagon, *Roman Nature* (1992), 3.

census of which Pliny knew so much (*nat.* 3.29) may have taken place earlier than 73–4.[14] The final and most senior post, in Belgica, depends again on allusion (*nat.* 18.183), and is assigned to the years 74/5–6.

Pliny then held some position at Rome that brought him into daily contact with Vespasian (Pliny, *epist.* 3.5.9), and which Syme suggested was the Prefecture of the Watch.[15] He died in his fifty-sixth year as prefect of the Misenum fleet at the eruption of Vesuvius, 25 August 79 (Pliny, *epist.* 6.16.9).

Works

Questions about the historical works involve their date of composition; to some extent consequently their chronological scope; and above all the extent to which they were used as sources by later writers, especially Tacitus in the *Histories* and *Annals*. Debate continues on all, especially the last. Pliny's works were catalogued by his nephew for the benefit of Baebius Macer (T1),[16] on which C. Nailis justly comments that, in the younger Pliny's *quo ordine scribebat*, '*scribere*', 'write', does not mean '*edere*', 'publish'.[17] L. Braccesi argues that, in spite of his claim to give a complete list, other references in the younger Pliny make it clear that it is not exhaustive; but the additional items could all be excerpts and notes in private daybooks rather than finished original compositions, and the *De uiris illustribus urbis Romae* could have been part of them.[18] M. Sage[19] rebuts Braccesi's claim, made on the basis of the ascription to *Plinii Secundi Veronensis* in two classes of MSS, that the *De uiris illustribus urbis Romae* is the work of the elder Pliny or anyone of his circle.[20] He denies that the author of the anonymous biographies, who fails to cite his authorities as the elder Pliny made a point of doing, is anything of a historian, and conclusively lists errors that the elder Pliny either ought not or is known not to have made. M. D. Reeve and R. J. Tarrant[21] have also denied Pliny's authorship: Braccesi was misled by statements made about the extant MSS;[22] Reeve and Tarrant are inclined to accept the view of R. D. Sweeney[23] that the attribution is due to the mention in *HA* [Capit.] *Macr.* 4.2 of an *Aurelii Victoris cui Pinio* (*sic*) *cognomen erat*, which allowed the entry of *Plinio*.

'Pliny the Roman historian' is also credited by John Malalas with telling, along with Virgil and Livy, the story from Rome's earliest history of the rape of the Sabine

[14] A. B. Bosworth, *Athenaeum* 51 (1983), 73–4; W. Eck, *Historia* 24 (1975), 335–6, noted by Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 128 n. 221; Griffin, *Seneca*, 438 n. 2.

[15] Syme, *Tacitus*, 61; *HSCPh* 73 (1969), 226–7; doubts: *RP* 7. 505. Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 111, made him pass straight from the procuratorships to the Prefecture of the Fleet.

[16] See Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 215–16.

[17] Nailis, *PhS* 13–14 (1942–3), 3 f.

[18] L. Braccesi, *Introduzione al de viris illustribus* (Bologna, 1973), 96–116, esp. 109–10; the passages are Pliny *epist.* 3.5.10 and 17; 6.16.2.

[19] Sage, *Hermes* 108 (1980), 87.

[20] Braccesi, *Introduzione al de viris illustribus* (cit. n. 18), 97–116. Pliny's circle: 112, 115; private use: 112 and 114, with Sage, *Hermes* 108 (1980), 91–2. The MSS in question are Classes C and D of E. Pichlmayr (Teubner, Leipzig, 1911), xxi (*codicibus manuscriptis longe plurimis*, x). Sage concedes that all the MSS may derive from a single archetype as *Gaii Plinii Secundi oratoris Veronensis liber*.

[21] In *Texts and Transmission*, 149–50, with n. 4.

[22] W. K. Sherwin, *RhM* 112 (1969), 284–6.

[23] R. D. Sweeney, *RhM* 111 (1968), 191–2.

women. This item is included as a 'possible fragment' (F9), but with little confidence. There is no obvious occasion for Pliny to have told this story. Malalas is well acquainted with Virgil and Livy, but gives Pliny no other mention. The Slavonic translation of Malalas also has Pliny, but the early–mid seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* (ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1832), which takes over verbatim a witness of the text of Malalas more accurate than the twelfth-century Oxford Bodl. Barocci 182, according to E. Jeffreys and her collaborators,[24] replaces Pliny with Apollonius (an unknown), as it does Livy with Silvius (211.4 and 6).[25]

Pliny's first work after the monograph on *The Use of the Javelin in Cavalry Warfare* was the two-volume biography of Pomponius Secundus, written when he was still on military service and not long after the death of its subject, who remained in Germany until 54 or 55 and may have died there;[26] Pliny seems to have known Pomponius from early youth; he tells of a banquet offered by Pomponius to Gaius Caligula at which he himself may have been present (F1).[27]

The *Bella Germaniae* likewise were begun in Germany, and instigated by the dream Pliny had of Nero Drusus, Augustus' stepson (*PIR*^{2} C 857) who had inaugurated the Roman attempt to conquer Germany between 12 BC and AD 9, but who had died in 9 BC, earning the name of Germanicus for himself and his eldest son; Drusus pleaded in Pliny's dream for his due of recognition (T1.4). He probably finished the work after his return to Italy. The work is cited only by Suetonius and Tacitus; Symmachus in 396 hoped that he might obtain a copy (T4); the other works that his correspondent Protadius would find it easier to obtain were Livy and Caesar.[28]

The title of the work given by the younger Pliny, literally *Wars of Germania* (so Rives), is arresting. Departing from such titles as Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* or Aufidius Bassus' (78) *Bellum Germanicum*, it names the opponent in the genitive case, perhaps imputing responsibility. But the idea may simply have been to avoid too close a resemblance to Aufidius' title. The inference cannot be geographical: wars carried on in 'German' territory, beyond the Rhine: it would exclude the campaigns against the Cimbri and Teutones, 113–101 BC.[29] The phrase was used by Asinius Pollio (see Pollio 56 F11, where poetic influence, especially that of Horace, is noted); Pollio's phrase may have been picked up by Pliny.

[24] E. Jeffreys *et al.*, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Melbourne, 1986), xxxiii; their view of the MSS is largely accepted by J. Thurn in *Johannis Malalae Chronographia* (Berlin and New York, 2000), 11: 'unser wichtigsten . . . Texttrager'.

[25] 211 Dindorf: *καθὼς ὁ σοφώτατος Βηργίλιος ποιητής, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος Ῥωμαίων ἱστοριογράφος συνεγράψατο ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Σίλβιος* ('as the extremely wise poet Virgil says, and likewise also Apollonius, historian of the Romans, has recounted, and likewise Silvius'). The possibility arises that this passage concerning the rape of the Sabines refers to the account in the *De uiris illustribus* 2.1–3.

[26] W. Eck, *Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen* (Cologne, 1985), 20–1. Cichorius' view (*RS* 425), that Pomponius survived until the last years of Nero, was rebutted by Otto, *Philologus* 90 (1935), 483–94.

[27] See Syme, *RP* 7. 501. Cichorius, collecting the fragments of the biography, claimed (*RS* 424) that a remark in Pliny *epist.* 7.17.11 was a citation from the biography: *itaque Pomponius Secundus . . . si quid familiarium amicus tollendum, ipse retinendum arbitraretur, dicere solebat: 'ad populum prouoco'*. But it may have been an oral anecdote.

[28] Fate of the work: Lehnerdt, *Hermes* 48 (1913), 274–82.

[29] See *OLD* s.v. *bellum*; Sall. *hist.* 2.98.10: *exercitus hinc et cum eo omne bellum Hispaniae in Italiam transgredientur*.

The scope and slant of the *Wars*, which are remarkably prominent in the younger Pliny's catalogue,[30] in particular the implications of the reference to the dream about Drusus and his appeal to Pliny to preserve his memory, are certainly related to those of the work of Aufidius Bassus, discussed in the introduction to Aufidius Bassus (no. 78).[31] Pliny, writing under Claudius Caesar, Drusus' son, and under Nero, his great-grandson,[32] would give prominence to campaigns conducted by Germanicus and play up those of Drusus at the expense of Tiberius' achievements, setting himself against those who had displayed Tiberius as *uictor omnis Germaniae*; this tells against an opening date of AD 4, Tiberius' return to the Rhine.[33] Besides, Pliny with his twenty books was claiming to be comprehensive and to include all the wars with Germans that Rome had waged, starting presumably with the Cimbri and Teutones in 113 BC (cf. Tac. *Germ.* 37). His general historical work,[34] continuing that of Aufidius Bassus, set Pliny up as his predecessor's equal; the *Wars*, as Noè points out, outdid him; his preface to the *Natural History* confesses to rivalry with his predecessors.[35]

The triumph of Germanicus would have been a suitable terminal date for a work written in Tiberius' or even in Claudius' reign, but under Nero, when Claudius' cautious policy there could be exposed, Corbulo's abortive expedition of 47 (and his comments on it) would have made a suitably melancholy ending to a work that dealt with all Roman wars with the Germans.[36] This would also make the work more comprehensive and take advantage of Pliny's own experience in the region, notably with Corbulo among the Chauci. Nonetheless, there was no real break between the German policy of Claudius and that of Nero, so the melancholy end might still not be acceptable to the emperor. The *Wars* may have continued to the mid-to-late 50s, up to the time of writing.[37] Sallmann suggests that the expeditions recalled Drusus and his plans of expansion to the mind of the historian, giving his work a wider patriotism than the encomiastic creations of such predecessors as Velleius Paterculus; indeed the

[30] Note the way he is identified in F2.

[31] For thorough discussion see Sallmann, *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 581–96. Marx (*Klio* 26 (1933), 325) insists on the dependence of Pliny on Aufidius for Augustan and Tiberian times, starkly presented in his chart: *Klio* 29 (1936), 217.

[32] For the significance of this fact, and the patronage it claims, see Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 68; Schanz, *GRL* 2.2 (Munich, 1913), 337; Gundel, *RE* 21. 287; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 166.

[33] Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 129, citing Vell. 2.97.4 and Cassiodorus (Aufidius Bassus 78 F4). Peter's explanation (2. cxxxviii) was that the proemium does not reveal criticism of his predecessor Aufidius, but that Drusus' achievements had been eclipsed by the campaigns of Gaius Caligula, which flattery had extolled, mockeries though they were. AD 4: Koestermann, 229 on *ann.* 1.69.2.

[34] For the *opus iustum*, as he calls it at *nat. pr.* 20, of Pliny's regular *History*, Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 131 and 240 cites Velleius, whose own brief work he presents as a preliminary to a regular history: 2.48.5; 89.2; 99.3; 103.4; 114.4; 119.1.

[35] Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 128–9, following Timpe, *Triumph des Germanicus* (1968), 19–20, who makes 16 the end of Aufidius Bassus' work. Pliny's rivalry: *nat. pr.* 20.

[36] So Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 73–4, 77; Gundel, *RE* 21. 287; Syme, *Tacitus*, 288–9; *RP* 7. 500 ('melancholy'). Triumph of Germanicus: Koestermann, l.c. (n. 33).

[37] Peter 2. cxxxviii, thought of 55–8; Otto, *Philologus* 90 (1935), 490–1 of 57–8. Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 130 n. 134, favours the view of Paratore that it might have included the Batavian revolt, with the intention of magnifying the Flavian achievement; *contra*: Syme, *MH* 34 (1977), 131 (=*RP* 3, 988), n. 10.

criticism of Lentulus in F3 shows Pliny joining attacks on the sycophancy of earlier writers.[38]

There is some disagreement on the use made of the *Wars* by later writers, as there is on the use of the general history. Apart from named references in Tacitus and Suetonius there are passages involving persons and places either that Pliny's career links to him, or (at another remove) which occur in passages known to be linked to Pliny's work.[39] Then references to historians and their practices that seem to include him, or to be aimed specifically at him; in particular there is a famous dig at 'a person who enjoys filling volumes with the celebration of foundations and beams used by Caesar to construct a massive amphitheatre in the Campus Martius, in spite of the fact that it has been found consonant with the dignity of the Roman people to consign material of distinction to historical writing, and things of that sort to the daily records of the City'.[40] This has usually been taken to be aimed at Pliny, but the reference is not specific and does not deserve the status of a testimonium. Scholars who regard either of Pliny's works as the sole or main source of parts of surviving histories would be more generous in admitting passages as fragments or testimonia; such passages are mentioned here in footnotes, with references to modern commentators. We cannot be sure how much besides the fragments and passages discussed in the text is dependent on Pliny.

The importance of Pliny as a source for Tacitus' *Germania* is uncontested. In Syme's view Pliny was Tacitus' main authority, which he copied very closely.[41] Rives has expressed doubts about this claim: 'A comparison of Tacitus' account of Germanic tribes with that in Pliny *nat.* reveals more differences than similarities ... he may also on many points have preferred other sources.'[42] In particular, the monuments and burial mounds inscribed with Greek letters on the borders of Germany and Raetia, mentioned in 3.2, have been ascribed to information from Pliny.[43]

On the grounds that Pliny is named in F2 as if Tacitus were diverging from a main source, Fabia[44] concluded that Aufidius Bassus was Tacitus' primary source for Germany in the early books of the *Annals*, although there are other touches that suggest derivation from Pliny.[45] Münzer, rebutting the view of Fabia and Liebenam that Pliny was only a secondary source, claims that for the 'German' sections of the early *Annals* Pliny's monograph is the main source, as the continuation of Aufidius

[38] Sallmann, *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 599–601; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 129; note Paratore's claim (*RomBarb* 2 (1977), 149–82) that Tacitus took from Pliny his conception of Germans unspoilt by contact with Rome.

[39] Thus Nierhaus, *BJ* 153 (1953), 62, following L. Schmidt, *Gesch. der deutschen Stämme* 1 (2nd edn. Munich, 1938), 35, attributes the presence of the Batavians and Vangiones in the excursus on the Gauls in Lucan 1 to Pliny's *Bella Germaniae* (cf. *nat.* 4.104, 106). The Batavians were involved in Corbulo's campaign of 47 on the side of the Chauci, the Vangiones in Pomponius' campaign against the Chatti in 50.

[40] Tac. *ann.* 13.31.1.

[41] Syme, *Tacitus*, 127–8. So already Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2 (1887), 191, esp. in section 2 f.

[42] Rives, *Tacitus, Germania* (1999), 36 f.

[43] Norden, *Germanische Urgeschichte*[3] (1959), 207–9, approved by Rives, *Tacitus, Germania* (1999), 126.

[44] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 407–8. See also Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 130 n. 235.

[45] Mommsen, *Hermes* 13 (1878), 248–9, on Tacitus' description of Caligula as a child born in the camp (*ann.* 1.41.2), *contra* W. Liebenam, *NJPhP* 143 (1891), 878–9, is supported by Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 71 n. 1. For this description see below on F3.

is for the *Histories*.[46] From book 11, where Aufidius Bassus' works failed, Pliny had no rival. Peter likewise argues that Tacitus would have had recourse solely to Pliny for this section of the *Annals* as the most authoritative writer on Germany.[47] The episodes of 47, 50, and 58 involving Domitius Corbulo against the Chauci, Pomponius Secundus against the Chatti, and Duvius Avitus against the Frisii and Ampsivarii (Tac. *ann.* 11.18–20; 12.27–8; 13.53–7) suggest Pliny as a source, and it could be described as a *communis opinio* that he was behind the first passage and Dio 60 (61).30.4–6, though it has been challenged.[48] In Tac. *ann.* 13.57, an unusual method of obtaining salt by pouring salt water on burning logs is described that is identical with Pliny's account in *nat.* 31.82.[49] If the *Wars* were the source for these items in the *Annals*, they must have reached the year 58, although the incidents were important enough to have figured also in the main history in thirty-one books *A fine Aufidi Bassi*.[50] Tacitus' note on salt is too specific to have originated in the wide-ranging account of salt-extraction in the *Natural History*. It too might have come from the general history. But as Rives remarks,[51] however comprehensive the account of the wars against Germania was, the twenty books are likely to have contained much ethnographic material.

The date implied by the title of Pliny's general history *A fine Aufidi Bassi*, which he is thought to have written between 69/70 and 77 at the latest, and so when he was abroad on duty,[52] is discussed in the introduction to Aufidius Bassus (no. 78); Pliny emerges as a source (already familiar) for domestic politics in Tac. *ann.* in 55 (F4), and Fabia and Münzer start the work in about 50.[53] There is little dissent about the end of the work: the triumph of Vespasian and Titus in 71.[54] It was completed long before Pliny wrote the preface to the *Natural History* in which he mentions it (T6). His stated reason for keeping it from publication, fear of seeming to curry favour[55] with the Flavians, is inadequate, since it implies that the content was exceedingly favourable to them. Possible offence to survivors of previous regimes is most likely, although falling out of touch with political trends while he was abroad has also been suggested; when Pliny returned he found that Cluvius Rufus' version of events was already in circulation.[56] Ciaceri stressed Pliny's sympathy with Claudius, which

[46] Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 71 n. 2, against Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 406, and Liebenam (cit. n. 45), 878. Meister, *Hermes* 83 (1955), 92–106, argues at length for Pliny as the source of Tac. *ann.* 2.8.1–2.

[47] Peter 2. cxxxxviiii, n. 1 cites Muellenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, 4, 19, and 47, as champion of the idea that Pliny was Tacitus' primary source.

[48] Mehl (*Hermes* 107 (1979), 220–39, with a bibliography on this topic, 236–7), cites the doubts of Koestermann 65–7, on *ann.* 11.20.1. Pliny knew the imperial strategy and would not have attacked Claudius, whose father he had written the *Bella* to honour. Dio and Tacitus have made different things of their source; the original need not have conveyed approval of Corbulo's resentment.

[49] For this section of the *Annals* see Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 83.

[50] Rives, *Tacitus, Germania* (1999), 37.

[51] Ibid.

[52] 70–6: Syme, *Tacitus*, 293; *RP* 7. 209; 69–77.

[53] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 186–7; Münzer, *BJ* 104 (1899), 78 n. 1.

[54] So Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 189–90. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 58, suggests the end of the Batavian revolt as a possible *terminus*.

[55] For *ambitio*, see Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 130, rejecting the view of Ciaceri (*Processi politici* (1918), 391–2) that it does not imply currying favour.

[56] Pliny's dependence on Cluvius Rufus: Marx, *Klio* 29 (1936), 101. See Townend, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 98–120; 89 (1961), 227–48; *AJPh* 85 (1964), 337–77; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 132, is sceptical.

determined the fundamental character of Pliny's history, and his hostility to Nero—or rather to Agrippina and Seneca:[57] he wrote the *Histories* when he was away from Rome and found himself dissatisfied with it; when he wrote the *Natural History* he had modified his views, becoming harder on Nero and more qualified in his praise of Claudius.[58] This, necessarily, is speculation. In general, Pliny shows himself close to Flavian orthodoxy: as Peter remarks, Pliny's hostility to Nero himself is even more marked than Tacitus',[59] and he was equally hostile to Gaius. A particularly hostile attitude to A. Caecina, and praise for Verginius Rufus, are suggested by Townend as reasons for withholding the work: he told the truth about Caecina before his disgrace in the last years of Vespasian.[60] It is implausible that his attitude to one man amid so many miscreants should have prevented Pliny from publication. But as Tacitus remarked (*hist.* 1.1.2), the charge of *ambitio* was hard to avoid, especially for Flavian writers after the civil war.

Whether the *Histories* were ever published at all has been questioned: Townend notes that the work is accorded no detail in Pliny's catalogue.[61] Given, however, that Pliny mentions his intention of publishing in the preface to the *Natural History*, his nephew's failure would require explanation, and the bleak mention in the catalogue is better interpreted as discretion on a known work containing passages that would offend a dwindling band of survivors. The late publication in any case would have prevented the work being of much influence on works written immediately after it.[62]

Indeed, if scholars are right in seeing in Tac. *ann.* 13.31.1 (and possibly in *hist.* 2.50.2[63]) a scornful remark about the topics in which Pliny the historian interested himself,[64] there was much that would have been acceptable to earlier establishments. In *nat.* 16.200–2 he describes monster trees used by Agrippa, Tiberius, and Gaius for building-projects; in 19.24 the awnings of Nero's amphitheatres.[65] But that is not all that Tacitus criticizes: there is credulity over the participation of Antonia, Claudius' daughter, in the Pisonian conspiracy of 65 (F5). It may well again be Pliny who is the

[57] Pliny *nat.* 22.92; 35.201.

[58] Ciaceri, *Processi politici* (1918), 389–90, 391–2, 401, 432–3. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 59, is rightly cautious about the relations between the *Histories* and the *Natural History*.

[59] Noé (*Storiografia imperiale*, 134) notes the difficulty of extracting a Neronian narrative from the references in Pliny *nat.*

[60] Townend, *Latomus* 20 (1961), 336–7; *AJPh* 85 (1964), 339–40; he compares Josephus (*BJ* 4.634–44) who denounced Caecina before his disgrace. There is nothing in Josephus that amounts to a denunciation; Townend's thesis is rebutted by S. J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (Leiden, 1979), 86 n. 7.

[61] Townend, *Hermes* 108 (1980), 233–42. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 59, is cautious of over-ambitious claims for what may be deduced of their content (naming Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 163). What is common to Pliny *nat.* and Tacitus might have come from another historian and from him to Tacitus; Tresch (61) is sceptical of Pliny's influence on Tacitus.

[62] Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 58–9.

[63] *ut conquirere fabulosa et fictis oblectare legentium animos procul gravitate coepti operis crediderim, ita vulgatis traditisque fidem demere non ausim.* ('While I would believe it to be out of keeping with the seriousness of the work on which I have embarked to collect fabulous stories and to please the minds of my readers with inventions, I would not presume to remove all trust in popular traditions.')

[64] Tacitus is describing events of AD 56. The amphitheatre in question (Suet. *Nero* 12.1, with B. H. Warmington *Comm.* (Bristol, 1977), ad loc.; Pliny *nat.* 16.200–2) was made of wood and built within a year. *Annales* represent history proper; the 'daily record' of the Roman people necessarily something more ephemeral. E. Champlin, *Nero* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003), 41, dissents.

[65] So Townend (*Hermes* 108 (1980), 233–42) regards Pliny as the source of Suet. *Nero* 31.1, with Pliny devoting a book to the year 66.

target of Tacitus' ostensibly self-directed criticism when he inserts an omen into his narrative at *hist.* 2.50, since Pliny relates the identical omen (*nat.* 10.135). Another passage, the reference of which is even less clear, is Tac. *hist.* 2.101.1, which blames Flavian writers for softness on the men who betrayed Galba and then Vitellius (specifically Alienus Caecina and Lucilius Bassus); but Pliny did not publish while they were alive.

Tacitus' critical attitude towards Pliny, which is rather different from that of Pliny's nephew when writing, in 105–6 (Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 35), to a retired imperial secretary, Titinius Capito, who was interested in history (T2), and his announced intention of following a consensus where it existed (F4), make it unlikely that he followed him at any point as a single source except for matters in which he was an acknowledged expert (German wars). This is one reason for rejecting Momigliano's theory that Pliny collated the works of Cluvius Rufus and Fabius Rusticus and became Tacitus and Dio's sole source for the late Julio-Claudian period;[66] and there is also the question of chronological precedence: Questa believed that Fabius Rusticus wrote against an attack by Pliny on Seneca.[67]

Pliny has been taken to be the source behind the accounts of the Year of the Four Emperors given by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Plutarch,[68] though Fabius Rusticus has his champions, who have noticed discrepancies between Tacitus and Pliny.[69] It would be unwise to assume, in the face of Tacitus' own citation of other authors, such as Vipstanus Messalla, and his references to a plurality of authors (Tac. *hist.* 3.59), that he followed one authoritative source; Peter (2. cliii) cites Josephus, *BJ* 4.9.2, for conflicting judgements among numerous writers Greek and Roman, but remarks that in the case of individual principates too there are conflicting accounts: the stories got into the tradition before the Flavians unified it. He believes that the common source was composed after the 'conspiracy', death, and disgrace of Eprius Marcellus and A. Caecina, i.e. in the last years of Vespasian or under Titus (cf. Tac. *hist.* 1.53; 67–8; 2.23; Plut. *Otho* 6). This dating, and the frequent resort of the historians to what they had heard and seen, would exclude Pliny.

(BML)

[66] So already Cichorius, *RS* 435; Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 830–6; *contra*: Peter 2. clviii; Syme, *Tacitus*, 291–2; and Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 59. Pliny as a source for Neronian history, in particular for Dio: Gercke (*JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 159–78, discussed by Griffin, *Seneca*, 429) had already concluded that 'im Übrigen darf man Dios Darstellung wohl unbedenklich als einheitliche Bearbeitung von Plinius' Geschichte betrachten', and as a source shared by Suetonius, 178–96. Gercke's argument, 200, that the agreement of *ann.* with Dio and Suetonius is evidence for Tacitus' dependence on Pliny, is unconvincing. Groag (*JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 777–85, with Detlefsen against Nissen) had already rejected Pliny (and others) as a 'main source' for *hist.*; so too Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 59.

[67] Questa, *Studi sulle fonti*[2], 84–91; Griffin (*Seneca*, 427–40) has cast serious doubt on the idea of any hostility to Seneca on the part of Pliny.

[68] So Th. Wiedemann, *de Tacito Suetonio Plutarcho Cassio Dione scriptoribus imperatorum Galbae et Othonis* (Diss. Berlin, 1857); Nissen, *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548, Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 184–209; Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 159–60; Hardy, *Studies* 1 (1910), 327–9. Norden, *Germanische Urgeschichte*[4] (1959), 211, discovered Pliny's work behind the *bellum Germanicum* (Frontinus, *Strat.* 4.3.14) that is the subject of the fourth and fifth books of Tacitus' *Histories*.

[69] Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 790–2; Detlefsen, *Philologus* 34 (1876), 40

81

P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus

Editions: Peter 2. cxxx, 99.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865); H. Kunnert, 'P. Clodius (58) Thrasea Paetus', *RE* 4 (1900), 99–103; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 649–50; A. Stein, *PIR*[2] 2 (1936), C 1187; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 169–70; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976), esp. 193 and 366; J. Geiger, 'Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus on Cato the Younger', *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 48–72; M. T. Griffin, *Nero: The End of a Dynasty* (London, 1984), esp. 171, 177, 277–8.

Life

Peter classified Thrasea with P. Anteius as a writer who composed biographies not for the sake of their subjects but with the idea of rousing hostility to the emperor Nero, and who found imitators in Domitian's reign. He was a native of Patavium (Tac. *ann.* 1.16.1; Dio 61.15.2), who first emerged in 42 when he was trying to prevent the suicide of his mother-in-law Arria (Pliny *epist.* 3.16.10), wife of Caecina Paetus, the conspirator against Claudius. His political stance is also clear from his evident adoption of his father-in-law's *cognomen*, and it was made firm by Stoic philosophical tenets. Yet he was a pragmatic politician who was willing to collaborate with the regime established in the early years of Nero's reign (54–9), presumably as providing the senate with the best conditions it could hope for.[1] Accordingly he held a suffect consulship in the closing months of 56, as well as being a *quindecimuir sacris faciundis* (Tac. *ann.* 16.22.1), and was criticized for not making more of the freedom of those days (Tac. *ann.* 13.49.1–2).

He walked out of the senate after the murder of Agrippina (Tac. *ann.* 14.12.1; 16.21.1; Dio 65.15.1) and stopped attending, perhaps realizing that Nero's self-restraint depended on her survival as a threat. In his seclusion he cultivated good society and celebrated the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius (Iuv. *sat.* 5.36). He was back in the senate in 62, defending a man convicted of diminishing *maiestas* (Tac. *ann.* 14.48.3; 16.21.1). Already an object of imperial displeasure in 63, he was prevented from going to Antium with the rest of the senators to congratulate Nero on the birth of a daughter (Tac. *ann.* 15.23.4). That was followed by a further three years' absence from the House.[2] Thrasea was forced to suicide in 66, Cossutianus Capito and Eprius Marcellus attacking him at Nero's instigation in the aftermath of the Pisonian and Beneventum conspiracies.[3] His daughter Fannia carried on the family tradition of principled obduracy.[4] She had been given the name (unless Thrasea was connected

[1] The conditions were set out in Nero's accession speech, which was written by Seneca: Tac. *ann.* 13.4. For Thrasea's attitude see Griffin, *Seneca*, 103.

[2] Tac. *ann.* 16.22.1; Dio 62.26.3; absences in 65: Tac. *ann.* 16.21.1–2; 22.1; 28.3.

[3] Tac. *ann.* 16.21.3–22, 24–9, 33–5; *hist.* 5.6–8; Dio 62.26.1; 3–4; Suet. *Nero* 37.1; Plut. *mor.* 810A.

[4] Pliny *epist.* 7.19.4; Tac. *ann.* 16.34.2.

with a separate family of Fannii) of Fannius Caepio, who had been condemned and killed for conspiring against Augustus.[5] She married Helvidius Priscus, who was executed in Vespasian's reign,[6] and it was at her request that Herennius Senecio (no. 89) wrote the biography of Helvidius Priscus that proved fatal to him under Domitian.[7]

Works

Thrasea was evidently an effective forensic orator, helping to secure the condemnation of Cossutianus Capito in 57 (Tac. *ann.* 16.21.3), and he performed on the Paduan stage in the garb of a tragedian,[8] but the only work attributed to him is his biography of the younger Cato, in which he followed the writer contemporary with Cato, Munatius Rufus (no. 37), whose work was cited by Plutarch, sometimes evidently from Thrasea (T1/F2), whom Peter regarded as Plutarch's main source.[9] However, it was not Plutarch's normal practice to depend on one source alone—except in such cases as the *Coriolanus*, where Dionysius of Halicarnassus was the only detailed account available to him—and in the passage dealing with Munatius Rufus (T2/F1) it cannot be assumed that he knew Munatius' account only at second hand, through Thrasea, in spite of the statement about his authority for F2; he may have read both authors, which makes F1 somewhat doubtful as a fragment of Thrasea. In Griffin's view the passage in the *Annals*[10] on Thrasea at the point of death telling Rusticus to shun current public life echoed Thrasea's biography; Thrasea is responsible for the story in Plutarch (*Cat. min.* 66.3) that Cato on his deathbed advised his son against it in the political conditions of their day. See comm. on Munatius Rufus 37 F2–3.

Writing a life of the martyr Cato, like the honour shown to Cassius by A. Cremutius Cordus in his historical work (71 F3), was emblematic of approval of the republican cause and so could be taken to imply disapproval of the incumbent emperor.[11] *Anticatones* by contrast carried forward Caesar's response to Brutus.[12] Thrasea had provided writers who followed with a fresh example; he was praised by Q. Junius Arulenus Rusticus (suff. 92), who paid with his life for that and for lauding Helvidius Priscus.[13] By the time Plutarch wrote, however, after the death of Domitian[14] and bracketing Cato with Phocion, a heroic Greek loser of the fourth century BC, the subject had lost its dangerous potency.

[5] See *PIR*² V 117.

[6] Pliny *epist.* 7.19.4; Tac. *ann.* 16.28.1; 35.1; *hist.* 4.5; Dio 66.12.1; 3.

[7] *PIR*² V 118; biography: Tac. *Agr.* 2.1; Dio 67.13.2.

[8] Tac. *ann.* 16.21.1; Dio 61.20.4; 62.26.3–4.

[9] Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 65–8. Griffin, *Seneca*, does not rebut the claim.

[10] Griffin, *Seneca*, 366, and *Nero* (1984), 177, on Tac. *ann.* 16. 26. 5.

[11] For Cato's status see e.g. Luc. 1.128, with Griffin, *Seneca*, 192–4, contrasting Seneca's thinking with that of Thrasea and Lucan. Disapproval of the incumbent: Griffin is cautious; *Seneca*, 187; *Nero*, 171 and 277 f.

[12] Brutus' *Cato* and Caesar's reply: Plut., *Cat. min.* 11.2; *Caes.* 54.3. For *Anticatones* see Griffin, *Seneca*, 360 n. 3 and 187 n. 8 on Augustus' *Rescripta Bruto de Catone* of Suet. *Aug.* 85.1.

[13] Tac. *Agr.* 45.1; Suet. *Dom.* 10.3, bracketing Thrasea with Helvidius Priscus as a subject of biography, but probably by mistake; cf. Rusticus 88 T2–4.

[14] C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 136.

Thrasea's biography was presumably written in Latin, for an audience of elite Romans. It is not known when it was composed; given his political activity, it could have been at any stage in his career. In Griffin's view (*Seneca*, 193), based on the Plutarch life, which was derived from it at least in part (see comm. on Munatius Rufus 37 F2–3), it dealt in detail with Cato's political career.

(BMI.)

82

Cn. Domitius Corbulo

Editions: Peter 2. cxxxii–cxxxviii, 99–101.

Principal discussions: S. Egli, 'Die Feldzüge in Armenien 41 bis 63 n. Chr.', in M. Büdinger (ed.), *Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig, 1868); C. Wolffgramm, *Cn. Domitius Corbulo* (Progr. Prenzlau, 1874); C. Wolffgramm, 'Cn. Domitius Corbulo, der consul suffectus der Jahres 39', *Philologus* 44 (1885), 371–6; A. Imendoerffer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde der sechs letzten Bücher der Annalen des Tacitus* (Progr. primi gymn. Bruenn, 1891); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 334–7; A. Stein, 'Cn. Domitius (49) Corbulo', *RE* 5 (1901), 1425–6; id., 'Cn. Domitius (50) Corbulo', *RE* Suppl. 3 (1918), 394–410; D. T. Schoonover, 'A study of Domitius Corbulo as found in the "Annals" of Tacitus', Diss. Chicago (1909); D. Detlefsen, *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius und ihre Quellen* (Berlin, 1909), 119–20, 155–6; H. de la Ville de Mirmont, 'Cn. Domitius Corbulo', *RH* 118 (1915), 1–53; W. Schur, *Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero* (*Klio Beiheft* 15 (1923)); W. Schur, 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Kriege Corbulos', *Klio* 19 (1925), 75–96; A. Momigliano, 'Corbulo e la politica romana verso i Parti', *Atti del II Congresso dei Richerche e Studi Romani* 1 (Rome, 1931), 368–75 (=*Quinto contributo*, 649–56); A. Momigliano, 'Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone', *RAL* ser. 6, 8 (1932), 293–336 (=*Quinto contributo*, 799–836); M. Hammond, 'Corbulo and Nero's Eastern Policy', *HSCPh* 45 (1934), 81–104; Schanz–Hosius, 2[4] (1935), 652–3; E. Groag, *PIR*[2] D (1943), 141–2; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), 552 65; B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus* (Manchester, 1952); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 172; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958); G. B. Townend, 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48; Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales*[2] (1963), 212–19; J. Tresch, *Die Neronbücher in den Annalen des Tacitus* (Heidelberg, 1965), 63–9; R. Syme, 'Domitius Corbulo', *JRS* 60 (1970), 27–39 (=*RP* 2. 805–23); K. Gilmartin, 'Corbulo's campaigns in the East: an analysis of Tacitus' account', *Historia* 22 (1973), 582–626; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976); A. Mehl, 'Kaiser Claudius und der Feldherr Corbulo bei Tacitus und Cassius Dio', *Hermes* 107 (1979), 220–39, esp. 236–9; T. B. Mitford, 'Cappadocia and Armenia Minor: historical setting of the Limes', *ANRW* 2.7.2 (1980), 1169–1228, esp. 1175–6; R. K. Sherk, 'Roman Galatia: the governors from 25 B.C. to A.D. 114', *ANRW* 2.7.2 (1980), 954–1052, esp. 982–90; R. Martin, *Tacitus* (London, 1981); M. T. Griffin, *Nero: The End of a Dynasty* (London, 1984); R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 647–52; E. L. Wheeler, 'The chronology of Corbulo in Armenia', *Klio* 79 (1997), 383–97; F. J. Vervaet, 'CIL IX 3426: a new light on Corbulo's career', *Latomus* 58 (1999), 574–99.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Cn. Domitius Corbulo was well born, better born than Vespasian and C. Licinius Mucianus (Tac. *hist.* 2.76; Dio 62.19.2). The family and connections have been elucidated by Syme (*JRS* 60 (1970), 27–39). The Domitii probably belonged to the Apennine Vestini, coming from Peltuinum, where a *collegium heroi Corbulonis et Longinae* honours him.[2] His mother Vistilia, of Umbrian stock,[3] married six times, as Pliny tells us,[4] and Corbulo, from the fifth marriage, was rich in half-brothers and sisters, some notorious (Pliny *nat.* 7.162). One was Caesonia, last wife of Gaius Caligula, another P. Suillius, the accuser who was Seneca's enemy.

Corbulo's birth probably fell between 4 BC and AD 1,[5] which would enable him to reach the suffect consulship in 39, but all is not clear cut. Tacitus (*ann.* 3.31) tells of Domitius Corbulo, a praetorian senator, presumably father of the historian, quarrelling with a young *nobilis* in 21 and later criticizing the upkeep of Italian roads; he was appointed to a curatorship which he exercised with great severity. Dio 59.15, cf. 60.17, reports Domitius Corbulo's criticism of the curators and contractors, and claims that Caligula got him to prosecute them; this led to his consulship, i.e. that of 39. If the suffect of 39 was his father, the historian must have been consul a few years later, perhaps *c.*43,[6] because he was a consular by 47 (or the year before, according to *PIR*^{2} D 142), when he was in command of the Lower Rhine army. Another difficulty lies with the quaestorships and proconsulship of Asia that have to be allocated between father and son.[7] Many have been ready to hold that the consulship belongs to the general's father: the whole career was implausibly assigned to a single personage by Wolffgramm.[8]

The argument of Syme (*JRS* 60 (1970), 30) that Pliny, discussing the offspring of Vistilia, and specifically mentioning the consulship of two of her sons, does so to

[1] For Corbulo's portrait, found near *ILS* 972, see J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Iconographie* I (Stuttgart, 1982), 271, pl. 23; F. Poulsen, *RA* 36 (1932), 48; R. West, *Röm. Porträt-Plastik* I (Munich, 1933), 236, no. 281.

[2] Syme, *JRS* 60 (1970), 32–6, discussing *ILS* 9518 and *CIL* 9.3426.

[3] Ibid. 31.

[4] Pliny *nat.* 7.39: *Vistilia, Gliti ac postea Pomponi atque Orfiti, clarissimorum ciuium, coniunx, ex his quattuor partus enixa septimo semper mense, genuit Suillium Rufum undecimo, Corbulonem septumo, utrumque consulem, postea Caesoniam, Gai principis coniugem, octauo.* ('Vistilia, the wife of Glitius and afterwards of Pomponius and Orfitus, citizens of the highest rank, gave birth to four children by them, in every case in the seventh month; she went on to give birth to Suillius Rufus in the eleventh month and Corbulo in the seventh, each of whom became consul, and after that to Caesonia, the wife of emperor Gaius, in the eighth').

[5] Syme, *JRS* 60 (1970), 31.

[6] So Stein in *RE*, Groag in *PIR*^{2}; Hammond, *HSCPh* 45 (1934), 86; A. Degrassi, *I Fasti consolari dell' Impero Romano* (Rome, 1953), 11 and 13 ('poco prima del 46'); Syme, *Tacitus*, 788. *Contra*: Mommsen, *Staatsr.* 2^3. 1078 n. 2; Cichorius, *RS* 429–30.

[7] See *PIR*^{2} D 141 f. Quaestorship: *OGIS* 768. Proconsulship: J. H. Oliver, *AJPh* 100 (1979), 551–4; *RPC* I (1992), Docimium 3211 f. ('c. AD 50 (?)').

[8] Wolffgramm, *Cn. Domitius Corbulo* (1874); id., *Philologus* 44 (1885), 371–6. De la Ville de Mirmont, *RH* 118 (1915), 7 and 18 is inclined to distinguish the ex-praetor from the general.

distinguish them from fathers who did not reach that office, is persuasive. It leaves the consulship of 39 free for the general and historian, and likewise the proconsulship of Asia (late in the 40s). The arguments of Townend that Syme accepted[9] are part of an endeavour to detect Cluvius in the work of Dio (see Cluvius Rufus, no. 84), and ascribe not only the consulship of 39 to the younger Corbulo but, less confidently, the story of the road commission.

The general Corbulo emerges in Tacitus in 47 in the first of six extant sections devoted to his activities (Tac. *ann.* 11.18–20; Dio 60.30.3–6; the other five are 13.8–9; 35–41; 14.23–6; 15.3–17 (cf. F2); 24–31). Corbulo defeated the Canninefates and Frisii and was dealing with the Chauci but was recalled from over the Rhine by Claudius, with triumphal ornaments as a consolation after he had dug a canal. Tac. *ann.* 11.20.1 and Dio 60.30.5 record Corbulo's comment on his withdrawal, that republican generals had had a better time of it. However, he was not prevented from drawing lots for the proconsulship of Asia. His most important posting came with the new emperor in 54, when he was sent to the East as legate of Cappadocia and Galatia[10] to recover Roman suzerainty over Armenia from the Parthians (Tac. *ann.* 13.6–9; F1). On the chronology generally accepted, Corbulo spent 55–7 on preparations and training but achieved the goal with his campaigns of 58 and 59, taking Artaxata in 58 and Tigranocerta the following year (13.34–41; 14.23–6).[11] He then withdrew to the governorship of Syria, left vacant by the death of his rival Ummidius Quadratus (14.26; 15.6; Jos. *AJ* 18.140; cf. *BJ* 2.222; Dio 62.20.2). He was in action again when the new king of Armenia led an unsuccessful attack on Adiabene in 60 and was driven out. In 61 Corbulo asked for a separate general to deal with the Parthians, and Nero sent L. Caesennius Paetus (*ann.* 15.6; cf. 14.58; Dio 62.20.4). He had to intervene again in 62–3, when Nero's attempt to annex Armenia failed: the new commander was forced to surrender to the Parthians at Rhandeia. Corbulo, invested with power compared by Tacitus to that of Pompey the Great during the war against the pirates, brought the Parthians to an agreement, also solemnized at Rhandeia (15.24–31; Dio 62.19.3; 22.4). After settling with Vologaeses, Corbulo returned to Syria but was denounced by a former soldier of his, Arrius Varus (Tac. *hist.* 3.6; cf. *ann.* 14.58),

[9] Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 234–7, also making the point about the consular sons of comparatively undistinguished fathers; Tacitus' phrase *idem Corbulo* is introduced to add weight to an otherwise undistinguished figure. However, Woodman and Martin, ad loc., suggest that Tacitus' use of *idem* may imply that he wished specifically to rebut a tradition which credited the son with complaints about roads (282). It is possible that this tradition came from Cluvius Rufus, who was perhaps deliberately assigning the story to the wrong Corbulo. According to Townend, Dio's account of the German campaign resembles passages in Tacitus and Dio describing his eastern campaigns. It has passages that seem to derive from Pliny's *Histories*, and these in turn are indebted to Corbulo's memoirs (Townend l.c., citing Momigliano (*Quinto contributo*, 814–15)), while the story of the road commissioners bears the marks of Cluvius, who, being one of the two consuls displaced by Caligula in 39 (Dio 59.15.5), had reason to dislike Corbulo. The argument that Seneca's reference, in *dial.* 2.17.1, to a plain 'Corbulo' who reduced Cornelius Fidus to tears by calling him a plucked ostrich must be to the general is not convincing, if the father was notorious for pugnacity (see Griffin, *Seneca*, 44 n. 4). Townend also argues that the only plausible reason for such a belated consulship for the ex-praetor would be that in 39 his stepdaughter married Caligula.

[10] Corbulo's official position, much discussed, is not to the point here; see Vervaet, *Latomus* 58 (1999), 574–99, for the statement in the text and for bibliography.

[11] Wheeler (*Klio* 79 (1997), 383–97) shortens the period of preparation, starting the campaigns in 57 and putting the capture of Artaxata and Tigranocerta both in 58; 58–9 saw new attacks by Tiridates, 59 the arrival of Tigranes; the 'pause' came in 59–60 and Tigranes' invasion of Adiabene in 61.

summoned by Nero to Greece in late 66 or early 67, and ordered to commit suicide (Dio 63.17.2 and 5–6, cf. Tac. *hist.* 2.76; Amm. Marc. 15.2.5).[12] Corbulo had probably married the daughter of C. Cassius Longinus, suff. 30, who was exiled in 65 for having urged L. Silanus to conspire against Nero (Tac. *ann.* 15.52; 16.7–8), and their elder daughter was the wife of Annius Vinicianus, who was killed for involvement in the conspiracy of Beneventum (Tac. *ann.* 15.28; Suet. *Nero* 36.1; Dio 62.23.6).[13] Syme makes a convincing case for regarding Corbulo in mid-career as connected with L. Vitellius, the friend of Claudius, and at the end as associated with a group hostile to Nero.[14]

Works

The existence of a published work by Corbulo can be inferred from the fragments and from T1. Peter called it *commentarii*, but it is not so called in the sources (F1–4);[15] it is conceivable that the title was *Res gestae* (see T2, where Pliny claims to have paid attention to the *res gestae* of Corbulo; cf. Pliny *nat.* 6.40 (n.21): *res . . . gessere*).[16] The parallel with the title, or at least the opening words, of Augustus' work would make it tempting to see Corbulo's own hand, or that of a posthumous editor: such a title would accord with the general's pretensions.

However that may be, the memoirs certainly dealt with his achievements in the East, but they present four problems: whether they were merely his official reports or a worked up continuous narrative such as Caesar's or a full autobiography including his civil activities; whether they went back to the governorship in Germany; when they were published; and to what extent they were used, whether directly or indirectly, by Tacitus, Dio, and others.

Reports from the field were obligatory and will have appeared in the *acta senatus* for the reigns of Claudius and Nero. Premerstein and Schur insist on these reports as a basis for the extant narratives,[17] but they have too much comment and laudation of Corbulo to have depended entirely on such material: it had been worked up.[18] 'La volonté de se magnifier soi-même est incompatible avec le ton du rapport officiel: Corbulo a composé une oeuvre de caractère littéraire', says Bardon, and, as Peter notes, the narrative of Dio shows how careful Corbulo was in his dealings with Nero (e.g. 62.19.4; 23.6).[19] Schur's rebuttal of the idea of an autobiography, allowing only *commentarii* in the style of Caesar and citing the fact that maps were attached,[20] is not convincing. Pliny tells of a common geographical mistake made even by those who

[12] Uncertain date of Corbulo's death: Griffin, *Seneca*, 462–3.

[13] See Griffin, *Nero* (1984), 178–9.

[14] Syme, *JRS* 60 (1970), 38–9 (Vitellii); *Tacitus*, 860 (against Nero).

[15] Schur, *Klio* 19 (1925), 58, cf. 18, regards Tac. *ann.* 14.25, on the return journey of the Hyrcanian delegation, as derived from Corbulo; Stein, *RE* Suppl. 3. 404, notes 15.16 as coming from Corbulo's memoirs.

[16] *Commentarii*: Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 647–52, with discussion of their nature.

[17] A. v. Premerstein, *RE* 4. 757–8; W. Schur, *Klio* 19 (1925), 40, 76, 81.

[18] As Schur points out, *Klio* 19 (1925), 71, Tacitus exploited the reports (or the memoirs) to show up the unfit emperor Nero.

[19] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2. 172; Peter 2. cxxxv.

[20] Schur, *Klio* 19 (1925), 76, citing Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* 7. 261–2; so Questa, *Studi sulle fonti*[3], 212.

served under Corbulo,[21] not by Corbulo himself; maps had been sent which could have been part of Corbulo's own official reports, though hardly of worked-up memoirs. Pliny mentions the maps just after the mistaken ideas of Corbulo's subordinates; and they may be connected with Nero's own plans for military activity in the Caucasus, and distinct from Corbulo's work.[22] Peter's claim that this section represents a fragment is very tenuous. Military reports highly worked up into a continuous narrative, but excluding an account of Corbulo's civil career, of which we have no evidence, seem to be the most likely form of the work.

Any worked-up memoirs, whether military *commentarii* or an autobiography, were probably written in the period after 63 when active service ended,[23] or in a more leisurely way from nearer the beginning of his appointment. Since all the known citations are concerned with the East, it is unclear whether Corbulo wrote up his German campaign as well (such as it was). The fact that Tacitus gives us Corbulo's comment on Claudius' action in withdrawing him in 47 rather reveals the work of other writers.[24] As reported by Tacitus it was oral (*exclamauit*) and so could have been picked by another historian rather than being lamely reported by the speaker; most obviously the reporter was the elder Pliny, who served under Corbulo on the Rhine (see C. Plinius Secundus (no. 80)).[25] So too the critical stance of Tacitus at 11.19 (*Corbulo semina rebellionis praebebat*) came from someone other than Corbulo. It may have been the treatment he received in 47 that determined Corbulo to record his later achievements (and perhaps the earlier ones too, by way of introduction). It may be significant that Tac. *ann.* 11.18.2 takes that campaign as the beginning of his glory (*gloria, cui principium illa militia fuit*). As Questa points out (*Studi sulle fonti*[2], 213), Dio's account of the German campaign is more restricted than what he says about the East; one might conclude that memoirs were not available, but Corbulo may have treated his activities in Germany on a smaller scale than his great achievements in the East.

As to the date of publication, it is less likely that Corbulo published the memoirs himself than that they came out posthumously; their self-aggrandisement would have been provoking to an emperor with cause for suspicion.[26] The elder Pliny consulted the memoirs for the topography and history of Armenia, showing that, as might have

[21] *nat.* 6.40: *corrigendus est in hoc loco error multorum, etiam qui in Armenia res proxume cum Corbulone gessere; namque ii Caspias appellauere Portas Hiberiae, quas Caucasias diximus uocari, situsque depicti et inde missi hoc nomen inscriptum habent. et Neronis principis comminatio ad Caspias Portas tendere dicebatur, cum peteret illas quae per Hiberiam in Sarmatas tenduntur, uix ullo propter oppositos montes aditu ad Caspium mare* ('Here there is a mistake made by many persons, even those who very recently were active under Corbulo in Armenia: they have called "the Caspian Gates" those of Iberia, which we have said are named "the Caucasian Gates", and maps of the region that they have drawn and sent from there have this name written on them; and Nero's threat was said to be directed at the Caspian Gates, even though he was aiming at those which lead through Iberia against the Sarmatians; there is hardly any way of approaching the Caspian Sea because of the mountains that block the way').

[22] So Griffin, *Nero* (1984), 228.

[23] Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 651–2) thinks the work was composed as the political crisis developed, and was published before 66.

[24] Peter 2. cxxxiii n. 1, regarding Corbulo's exclamation as *cardo rei*, and citing Imendoerffer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde* (1891), 8, draws negative conclusions.

[25] Mehl (*Hermes* 107 (1979), 236–9) doubts whether in any of his works Pliny could have been so disrespectful of Claudius, but colour may have been laid on by others.

[26] Tac. *ann.* 14.58.1.

been expected, they were published before 77: Corbulo's family, notably his daughter Domitia, whose parentage is vaunted on *ILS* 272, would have been anxious for him to be vindicated and his reputation enhanced. During the reign of Vespasian the general who had been humiliated at Rhandeia, L. Caesennius Paetus, returned to favour and office: he was closely connected by marriage to the dynasty. Paetus would not have welcomed the publication of Corbulo's memoirs, and that favours the view that they came out as soon as possible after the death of Nero on 9 June 68. Galba claimed that he, like Corbulo, had been marked down for death by the late emperor.[27] On the other hand, Domitia married Domitian in 70 and her influence might have been enough for any objections of Paetus to be overcome.[28]

More difficult is the question of the use of the memoirs made by historians and other writers, especially Tacitus and Dio.[29] Slender verbal evidence was noticed by E. Koestermann, who pointed out (on *Ann.* 13.37.4) that the construction *expostularent cur* in the sense of 'complain' (*conqueri*) occurs in Tacitus only there and at 15.5.1 and may represent a glimpse of Corbulo's original wording. Given that Corbulo was the man on the spot on the Lower Rhine in the later 40s and in the East from 55 to 66, it seems inevitable that even if Tacitus and Dio did not use the memoirs directly (it is much less likely that Dio handled them than that Tacitus did), they used a writer who did, so that in a sense almost all we have derives from them.[30] However, Pliny was available for the German narrative, where we have not only military events but the reaction to them at Rome (unfavourable).[31] C. Licinius Mucianus, who is cited immediately alongside Corbulo in Pliny's list of authorities for books 5 and 6 (T1), may have campaigned under him; he shows interest in eastern matters but does not seem to have been an historian at all (see I. Appendix 1, A27). He may have corrected him, even if he did not write a historical account of the Parthian War.[32] Then there was A. Marius Celsus, the military man noted by Syme who mentioned Corbulo.[33] Who are the writers who were active under Corbulo in Armenia and produced erroneous reports of the topography is not stated by Pliny (*nat.* 6.40 (n. 21)); perhaps Mucianus again. But it would have been grossly negligent for any contemporary historian not to have read Corbulo's own account, although that may have happened if 'reliable' oral evidence was at hand. Several sources are implied for the stories of Corbulo's severity on his troops in Germany: *ferunt* at 11.18.5; *nimia et incerta an falso iacta*), but they do not exclude an account by Corbulo himself: these were particularly severe cases involving execution, which could well have glossed a more flattering general claim (*ueterem ad morem reduxit*, 11.18.2).

[27] Suet. *Galba* 9.2.

[28] For this marriage see B. Levick, *G&R* 49 (2002), 199–211.

[29] Opinions are reviewed by Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 64. The theory of Schoonover (*A Study of Domitius Corbulo* (1909)) that they depended on a laudatory biography has had short shrift (see Schur, *Klio* 19 (1925), 82), probably rightly, but that does not mean that there were no such things (Syme, *Tacitus*, 297).

[30] See the remarks of Peter 2. 100 on the sections of Pliny (*nat.* 6.23–39) (together with his F4), which he regards as dependent on Corbulo, but with other writers' contributions interlarded; so also Detlefsen, *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius* (1909), 119–20, 156.

[31] Tac. *ann.* 11.19.6. For further unfavourable comment, as at 15.6, see n. 39.

[32] Peter 2. CXXXV n. 1.

[33] Syme, *Tacitus*, 683; cf. *PIR*^{2} M 296: the identity of the legionary legate of XV Apollinaris in 63 (Tac. *ann.* 15.25.3) and the strategist *Κελσός* of Lydus *mag.* 3.33 p. 122 W, is conjectural (*fortasse*).

As to eastern events, traces of Corbulo's memoirs can certainly be found in Tacitus,[34] and notices of his campaigns in other writers may also go back to them, especially Dio 62.19–23; see also for possible echoes Front. *strat.* 2.9.5; 4.1.21; 4.1.28; 4.2.3; 4.7.2; Stat. *silu.* 5.2.34–41 (but this is much more probably owed to the oral report of Vettius Bolanus); Ampelius 39.4; John Lydus *mag.* 3.34; Themist. *or.* 16.210a p. 255 Dindorf; later references must have been written with knowledge of Tacitus and Dio. But it is a matter of controversy whether and how far Tacitus and Dio used Corbulo directly, as Peter 2. cxxxv, is inclined to believe, and how far what they wrote was derived from other or intermediate sources.[35] Given the number of historians and other writers active during this period, and Tacitus' own suspicions,[36] it pays to be cautious and select items where Corbulo's authorship is stated or firmly deduced.[37] So it might seem that Tac. *ann.* 14.23 has a strong case for inclusion among the fragments, for it begins with Corbulo's mental processes:[38] *post deleta Artaxata utendum recenti terrore ratus ad occupandam Tigranocerta* ... It is the same with 13.41.1, where Corbulo meditates (*agitauit*) a strike by night, and 15.12.1, where he is *interritus* by Pactus' calls for help. But these insights may be no more than deductions from his behaviour, or a report from another source on the spot, one of his officers. Tacitus focuses on the inner workings of a character's mind; he is the only source known to specify, at *hist.* 2.46.1, that Otho awaited news of the first battle of Bedriacum *nequaquam trepidus et consilii certus.* Suggestiveness is even less adequate, as with Tacitus' striking sentence *ann.* 15.31: *scilicet externae superbiae sueto non inerat notitia nostri, apud quos uis imperii ualet, inania tramittuntur.*[39] Peter 2. cxxxiii, draws attention to this as a point that might be made against Corbulo himself (the result of his twelve-year tenure was that Armenia passed into the hands of a Parthian nominee.) It is suggestive that Tacitus, who liked to pick up words and use them against those who exploited them, had already used the word *inanis* in connection with Corbulo (*corpore ingens, uerbis magnificis et super experientiam sapientiamque etiam specie inanium ualidus*).[40] Again, there is similar stress on discipline in the East as there is in the account of events in Germany; that may also go back to Corbulo's memoirs, but it is far from certain (Front. *strat.* 4.1.21; Tac. *ann.* 13.36.3; Juv. 3.251). Peter may well be right to detect Corbulo in Tacitus' and Dio's slighting view of L. Caesennius Paetus (F2). Less plausibly he recognizes him in linguistic details where Corbulo's merits are stressed.[41] Peter admits that Tacitus allows faults to appear:[42] reluctance to

[34] De la Ville de Mirmont, *RH* 118 (1915), 20 regards harangues and letters to the enemy as derived from Corbulo: 13.37; 39; 15.5; 12; 26.

[35] So Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 835, on Dio's derivation of the material from the elder Pliny, and the ultimate common source of Tacitus and Dio (see n. 8); but as Syme, *Tacitus*, 297 n. 6, points out, that does not disprove Tacitus' use of Corbulo's narrative.

[36] So Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 336 and de la Ville de Mirmont, *RH* 118 (1915), 21.

[37] It is certainly unsafe to reconstruct diplomatic manoeuvres on the basis of what Corbulo is believed to have omitted from his memoirs (Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 651, with Griffin, *Seneca*, 226 n. 5; he regards the negotiations of 13.61 as derived from them).

[38] Cf. Tac. *ann.* 13.8.4: *ut instaret famae.* At 11.20.1 we had already been given an insight into his mental processes: *multa simul offunderentur.* So also at 15.5: *moderandum fortunae ratus.*

[39] See the analysis of Gilmartin, *Historia* 22 (1973), 625.

[40] Tac. *ann.* 13.8.4.

[41] Peter 2. cxxxvi: 13.35.3: *satis constitit fuisse* at 13.35.3, as in F2 (*constitit*); 35.6, with *adnotatusque miles.*

[42] Gilmartin, *Historia* 22 (1973), 582–626, offers detailed assessment of Tacitus' attitude to Corbulo.

fight (15.3), in particular slowness in the rescue of Paetus (15.10.4; cf. Dio 62.22.1),[43] dislike of rivals (13.9.6–7; 15.6.4; 59), and boastfulness (15.26). Of these failings the second and third might be deduced by a historian from the memoirs themselves; their prominence does not show that Tacitus was using another historian,[44] but the first would be more difficult to establish and seems to imply a rival and hostile version. Certainly Tacitus, as in his account of Corbulo's German campaign, implies plural sources, and they were critical of Corbulo's activities.[45]

As to the source of Dio's account of Corbulo's eastern *acta*, its close relation to Tacitus is clear and close enough to be taken as derivative (but it has additional details, providing the name of the place where Paetus surrendered and Corbulo encountered Tiridates, Rhandeia, 62.21.1 and 23.2). Hence the view, accepted by Peter,[46] that both Tacitus and Dio depended on the memoirs. Schur, ingeniously but too schematically, contrasts two pairs of writers exploiting the source: Pliny–Dio on the one hand and Cluvius–Tacitus on the other, creating distinct accounts of the attempt to provincialize Armenia and of the peace of 63.[47]

(BML)

[43] On Tac. *ann.* 15.10, see Gilmartin, *Historia* 22 (1973), 613 n. 59, who follows Koestermann ad loc.; in their view Tacitus is hostile both to Paetus and to Corbulo, and Corbulo is not the main source; cf. 10. 4: *ferunt*.

[44] Questa, *Studi sulle fonti*[2], 217, relates Tacitus' unfavourable judgments to his reading of the memoirs, while Martin, *Tacitus* (1981), 181, ascribes the criticisms to the comments of Caesennius Paetus. Tac. *ann.* 15.26.3, combining servility to Nero, boasting of his own achievements, vilification of Paetus, and authoritative style of delivery, has certainly been subjected to interpretation.

[45] So Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 335 on 15.6, and on Corbulo's slowness to rescue Paetus. Peter 2. cxxxvi cites H. Schiller, *Geschichte des römischen Kaiserreichs unter der Regierung des Nero* (Berlin, 1872), 14–15, Fabia, 334–7, and other scholars for the view that Tacitus knew the work through another author, Aufidius Bassus (Fabia) or Mucianus (but see Appendix 1, A27). Schur (*Klio* 19 (1925), 79–80) thinks of Cluvius Rufus. Fabia's view, that nothing but 15.6 shows Tacitus using the memoirs, is unduly sceptical, and his reason for the neglect (the material had already been used by Pliny, Cluvius, and Rusticus) inadequate.

[46] Gutschmid, *Gesch. Irans und seine Nachbarländer* 2 (Tübingen, 1888), 131 (arguing that Tacitus boiled down the heroics to a minimum), cited by Peter 2. cxxxvii.

[47] Cf. Questa, *Studi sulle fonti*[2], 214 n. 65. For Momigliano's view, see n. 28.

83

C. Suetonius Paullinus

Editions: Peter 2. cxxxviii–cxxxviiii, 101.

Principal discussions: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 337–8; H. Dessau, *PIR* 3 (1898), S 694; D. Detlefsen, *Die Geographie Afrikas bei Plinius und Mela und ihre Quellen* (Berlin, 1908); F. Miltner, 'C. Suetonius (3) Paullinus', *RE* 4A (1932), 591–3; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 653; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 172; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 387; Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales*[2] (1963), 219–24; M. T. Griffin, 'Nero's recall of Suetonius Paullinus', *SCI* 3 (1976/7), 138–52; J. Desanges (ed.), *Pline l'Ainé, Histoire Naturelle Livre V, 1–46 (l'Afrique du Nord)* (Paris, 1980); R. Martin, *Tacitus* (London, 1981); M. T. Griffin, *Nero: The End of a Dynasty* (London, 1984); Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984); R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 645–7; A. R. Birley, *The Roman Government of Britain* (Oxford, 2005), 54–7.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Paullinus,[1] serving in Mauretania as praetorian legate in 41–2 (F1), was probably born in about AD 10 or just before.[2] Birley attributes his origin to Pisaurum, where the *nomen* 'Sueto' occurs.[3] His achievements in Mauretania are the first known events of his military career,[4] and were particularly noted as he became the first Roman general to cross the Atlas mountains.[5] His consulship (F1) followed, probably soon: Tacitus refers to him as 'the most senior consular' of 69.[6]

There is then silence until Paullinus was appointed by Nero in 58 to resume the conquest of Britain in succession to Q. Veranius.[7] Veranius had subjugated Lycia for Claudius, and so was another general experienced in campaigning in mountainous terrain. This helps to explain their appointment to Britain: the conquest had been hanging fire in the face of resistance on the borders of Wales. Nero, deciding to push

[1] For the spelling see Birley, *Roman Government* (2005), 47, with n. 103 for epigraphic evidence.

[2] Ibid. 48, arguing from his praetorship, before 42, says 'at latest *c.* 11, perhaps considerably earlier'.

[3] Ibid.; Syme, *Tacitus*, 781, speaks only of 'a faint chance'. Birley goes on to suggest that he was chosen for Mauretania as a result of the influence of Arrecinus Clemens of Pisaurum, praetorian prefect in 41; but fellow townsmen can be antagonistic.

[4] The phrase *Britannicis expeditionibus*, Tac. *hist.* 2.37.1, need not mean that he had been in Britain (first with Claudius?) before 58.

[5] F1 and cf. Dio 60.9.1.

[6] *uetustissimus consularium*: Tac. *hist.* 2.37.1 (Othonian? or in general?). A date of around 42 for the consulship is suggested by Peter 2. cxxxviii. Birley, *Roman Government* (2005), 48, argues for a date before 47, when his successor in Mauretania was consul.

[7] For the date see Birley, *Roman Government* (2005), 48: the two successful campaigns of Tac. *Agr.* 14.3, followed by the revolt of Boudica – in 60, as argued by Syme, *Tacitus*, 765–6.

ahead (rather than to give up the province),[8] must not be less successful than his derided predecessor, whose great achievement was the invasion; but Veranius died in office.[9] Paullinus, who might also have been stimulated by rivalry with Cn. Domitius Corbulo (no. 82), then active against the Parthians, as much as by Veranius' claim in his will that he could have reduced the island in two more years,[10] took on the conquest of Wales and enjoyed two years' successful campaigning, but was drawn back from the subjugated Mona (Anglesey) by the revolt of Boudica in AD 60. Abandoning Verulamium and Londinium,[11] he retreated along Watling Street to join his main force, and defeated the rebels, perhaps near Mancetter, but his dangerous severity to the provincials in the aftermath was reported to Nero by the new procurator in Britain, and Paullinus was eventually recalled in 61, to be followed by two unaggressive administrators. The advance was not resumed until Vespasian was in power, although Vitellius may originally have intended Vettius Bolanus to take it up.

Whether Paullinus' apparent ups and downs are significant or due only to the condition of the evidence is uncertain:[12] it would be facile to attribute the first 'eclipse' to the ascendancy of Agrippina (49–59), perhaps also to connect the second with his falling foul of the well-connected procurator and the imperial freedman Polyclitus, whom Nero sent to inspect the province, especially if Suetonius' son was consul in 66.[13] Suetonius next emerges in 69 as one of Otho's leading generals in the struggle against Vitellius.[14] Tacitus, who is sympathetic to him, perhaps, as Koestermann suggested,[15] because his own father-in-law Agricola had been appointed military tribune by Paullinus and served at his headquarters in Britain, calls him 'reputedly the greatest general of the day' and insists on the neglect of his advice as a cause of Otho's defeat.[16] He allows him to speak in his own person.[17] However, he is not uncritical: Paullinus' caution could be called hesitancy (*cunctatio*).[18] After that Paullinus made his peace with Vitellius, claiming that his advice to Otho had been intended to bring him down; this marked the end of his career,[19] whether for his age or his eminence.

[8] Cf. Suet. *Nero* 18. [9] Birley, *Roman Government* (2005), 37–43.

[10] The boast of Tac. *ann.* 14.29.1 is adduced by Birley, ibid. 49.

[11] For the revolt and Paullinus' campaign see Tac. *Agr.* 14–16, cf. 5; 18; *ann.* 14.29–39; cf. *hist.* 2.37.1; Dio 62.7–12, with G. Webster, *Boudica* (2nd edn., London, 1993), 83–112.

[12] Syme, *Tacitus*, 3, considers that he was called 'out of retirement' to replace Veranius; Birley, *Roman Government* (2005), 48, would not rule out a governorship on the Rhine or in Pannonia, or Dalmatia in the late 40s or early 50s: there are vacancies.

[13] Griffin, *SCI* 3 (1976/7), 147, cf. also Miltner, *RE* 4A. 592; Desanges, *Pline l'Ainé*, 136, like A. Degrassi, *I Fasti consolari dell'impero romano* (Rome, 1953), 12, and Chilver, *Comm.* on Tac. *hist.* 1.87.2, gives the consulship of 66 to Paullinus himself, as do Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 653, Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 337, and Dessau *PIR* 3, S 694 (with hesitation). Griffin points out (n. 41) that Nero seems to have avoided iterated consulships.

[14] Tac. *hist.* 1.87, 90; 2.23–6, 32 f., 37, 39 f.; 44; Plut. *Otho* 5, 7–8, 11, 13.

[15] Koestermann on Tac. *ann.* 14.30.3.

[16] Reputation: Tac. *hist.* 2.32.1; cf. 37.1; *diligenti et moderato duci*, *Agr.* 5.1; *ann.* 14.33.1.

[17] Tac. *hist.* 2.32.

[18] Ibid. 2.25.2, and the apology to Vitellius was ignominious. See de la Ville de Mirmont, *RH* 118 (1915), 49–53, and Martin, *Tacitus* (1981), 192–3, arguing that Tacitus takes a balanced view: there was delay, but a successful outcome (*hist.* 2.24.1), and his reason for breaking off the engagement understandable (2.26.2). He thinks that the account was based partly on a 'version supplied' by Paullinus, but does not claim a written account.

[19] Tac. *hist.* 2.60.1.

Works

Peter asserted unhesitatingly that Paullinus, like Corbulo, wrote *commentarii*, and Lewis concurs. Pliny cites him for his description of Africa, but reports nothing from him in the British section.[20] He may have figured in the lost books of Tacitus that dealt with Caligula and Claudius up to AD 47. The view of Syme, followed by Koestermann,[21] that Paullinus might have transmitted information about Britain to Tacitus is possible, but few believe that a memoir of his was the source for accounts of the British campaigns of the late 50s and 60–1; Peter thinks that both Tacitus and Dio may have derived their versions from Aufidius Bassus, Servilius Nonianus, or Pliny, or that Dio took his from Tacitus,[22] while Questa's view is that Pliny and Fabius Rusticus are the sources for the eleven chapters 14.29–39.[23] Admittedly Paullinus is reported as making a claim about the civil war of 69 (*'ferebat'*, *hist.* 2.26.13), but no one thinks he wrote on that: oral transmission to one of Tacitus' sources is the likely route, as in 2.34.5.[24] One passage in Tacitus, referring to conflicting casualty figures, makes it clear that he had access to more than one source, directly or indirectly.[25] Nor is Griffin, though she would not categorically exclude the possibility of memoirs of the British campaigns, willing to see Paullinus as the source, either direct or indirect (by way of Fabius Rusticus).[26] What has given support to the idea of Paullinus as a source of Tacitus is the difference between his tone towards him in the *Agricola* and the *Annals*, but Griffin accounts for that as the result of a change of points of view: there could be only one victim of imperial jealousy in the *Agricola*. It seems reasonable to conclude with Peter that the memoir did not go further than Suetonius' campaign in the Atlas.[27] That might have been written in a period of leisure (or eclipse) after the consulship, either immediately or perhaps in the mid-50s as an advertisement to a new, young emperor that competent generals were available besides Corbulo (or Veranius).[28]

(BML)

[20] For the sources of this section, see Detlefsen, *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius* (Berlin, 1909), 67.

[21] Syme, *Tacitus*, 297; Koestermann on Tac. *ann.* 14.30.3.

[22] Tac. *ann.* 14.37.2; casualties exaggerated by Dio 62.2.2.

[23] Questa, *Studi sulle fonti*[2], 220–4.

[24] See Chilver, *Comm.* ad loc.

[25] Tac. *ann.* 14.37.2.

[26] Griffin, *SCI* 3 (1976/7), 149–52. Other sceptical views: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 337–9, arguing that his work might have been used by Aufidius Bassus and Servilius Nonianus, so that Tacitus could neglect them; Syme, *Tacitus*, 765; Martin, *Tacitus* (1981), 210; *contra*: N. Reed, *Latomus* 33 (1974), 926–7.

[27] So Peter 2. cxxxviii, and Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 646–7.

[28] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 338 claims that Paullinus would have written his memoirs immediately; Lewis that they would have been composed only in safer times, under Vespasian (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 646).

84

Cluvius Rufus

Editions: Peter 2. clxv–cxviii, 114–15.

Principal discussions: Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs* (1865); O. Clason, *Plutarch und Tacitus* (Berlin, 1870); O. Clason, *Tacitus und Suetonius* (Breslau, 1870); T. Mommsen, 'Cornelius Tacitus und Cluvius Rufus', *Hermes* 4 (1870), 295–325 (= *Ges. Schr.* 7 (Berlin, 1909), 224–52); H. Nissen, 'Die Historien des Plinius', *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548; J. H. K. F. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserreichs unter der Regierung des Nero* (Berlin, 1872); K. Nipperdey, *Opuscula* (Berlin, 1877), 436–9; F. A. C. Schemann, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der jüdischen Archäologie* (Diss. Marburg, 1887); C. Baier, *Tacitus und Plutarch* (Frankfurt a.M., 1893); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 170–81, 199–209, 376–80, 398–403; A. Gercke, 'Seneca-Studien. II. Hist.-biographische Untersuchungen über Seneca u. seine Zeit', *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (Leipzig, 1896), 159–262, esp. 252–62; E. Groag, 'Zur Kritik von Tacitus' Quellen in den Historien', *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (Leipzig, 1897), 709–98; E. Klebs, *PIR* C (1897), 958; E. Groag, 'Cluvius (12) Rufus', *RE* 4 (1900), 121–5; O. Seeck, 'Der Anfang von Tacitus' Historien', *RhM* 56 (1901), 227–32; C. E. Borenius, *De Plutarcho et Tacito inter se congruentibus* (Helsinki, 1902); E. Wölfflin, 'Plinius and Cluvius Rufus', *ALLG* 12 (1907), 345–54; E. G. Hardy, 'Plutarch, Tacitus, and Suetonius, on Galba and Otho', in *Studies in Roman History* 1 (Oxford, 1910), 294–333, esp. 324; G. Hölscher, 'Josephus (2)', *RE* 9 (1916), 1934–2000, esp. 1985–7; E. Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), 387–434; A. Momigliano, 'Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone', *RAL* ser. 6, 8 (1932), 293–336 (= *Quinto contributo*, 799–836); M. P. Charlesworth, 'The tradition about Caligula', *CHJ* 4 (1933), 105–19, esp. 114–19; E. Groag, *PIR*^{2} C (1933), 1206, cf. 1202; M. P. Charlesworth, *CAH* 10 (1934), 867; F. R. B. Godolphin, 'The source of Plutarch's thesis in the lives of Galba and Otho', *AJPh* 56 (1935), 324–8; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 647–8; J. Martin, 'Zur Quellenfrage in den Annalen und Historien', in H. Homel *et al.* (eds.), *Studien zu Tacitus: Festschr. C. Hosius* (Stuttgart, 1936), 21–58; E. Manni, *Introduzione allo studio della storia greca e romana* (2nd edn., Palermo, 1959); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 167–9, 175; F. Klingner, 'Tacitus und die Geschichtsschreiber des 1. Jahrhunderts n.Chr.', *MH* 15 (1958), 194–205 (= *Röm. Geisteswelt*^{4} (1961), 469–89); Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 178–9, 293–4, 675–6; D. Timpe, 'Römische Geschichte bei Flavius Josephus', *Historia* 9 (1960), 474–502; G. B. Townend, 'The sources of the Greek in Suetonius', *Hermes* 88 (1960), 98–120; G. B. Townend, 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48; G. B. Townend, 'The reputation of Verginius Rufus', *Latomus* 20 (1961), 337–41; L. H. Feldman, 'The sources of Josephus' Antiquities Book 19', *Latomus* 21 (1962), 320–33; Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli annales*^{2} (1963), esp. 175–226; G. B. Townend, 'Some rhetorical battle-pictures in Dio', *Hermes* 92 (1964), 467–81; G. B. Townend, 'Cluvius Rufus in the "Histories" of Tacitus', *AJPh* 85 (1964), 337–77; J. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher in den Annalen des Tacitus* (Heidelberg, 1965), 55–8; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 219–21; H. W. Ritter, 'Cluvius Rufus bei Josephus? Bemerkungen zu Ios. ant. 19, 91 f.' *RhM* 115 (1972), 85–91; G. B. Townend, 'The earliest scholiast on Juvenal', *CQ* 22 (1972), 376–87; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976), esp. 427–40; L. Bessone, 'Cluvio Rufo sul *bellum Neronis*', *Aevum* 52 (1978), 100–14; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale pretacitiana* (1984), 102–5; T. P. Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus: Death of an Emperor* (Exeter, 1991), 111–18; D. Wardle, 'Cluvius Rufus and Suetonius', *Hermes* 120 (1992), 466–82; E. Bispham, 'Carved in stone: the municipal

magistracies of Numerius Cluvius', in A. E. Cooley (ed.), *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy* (London, 2000), 39–75, esp. 47–54; I. Di Stefano Manzella, 'Il prenome (*Marcus* o *Publius*) dello storico Cluvius Rufus', in *Επιγραφαί: Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di L. Gasperini* (Rome, n.d. [2000]), 309–20 (with bibliography); K. Scherberich, 'Josephus und seine Quellen im 19. Buch der *Antiquitates Iudaicae* (*ant. Iud.* 19, 2–173)', *Klio* 83 (2001), 134–51, with bibl. 134–42; O. Devillers, 'La Composante biographique dans l' historiographie romaine impériale avant Tacite', in G. Lachenaud, D. Longrée (eds.), *Grecs et romains aux prises de l'histoire* (Rennes, 2003), 2. 606–19.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Cluvii are found at Capua in the late third century BC, moving from there to Puteoli after the punishment of the city in 211, and at Rome from the end of the century; the most important branch in Campania was that at Puteoli.[1] Cluvii were engaged in commerce in the Greek East during the first century BC,[2] and senatorial rank is attested from the 170s, when two Cluvii reached the praetorship.[3] In 29 BC Cluvii formally reached consular rank when a C. Cluvius who had been elected consul and been prevented from taking office was granted it by Octavian (Dio 52.42.4). Evidently he was *persona grata* to the new ruler.

Like Servilius Nonianus and Tacitus, Cluvius Rufus[4] was a historian who had reached the highest office in the Roman state, as his governorship of Tarraconensis is sufficient to show (T1), and, again like Nonianus, he frequented the court. His consulship was suffect and its date is uncertain; Suetonius refers to him as a consular in 65 (Suet. *Nero* 21.2).[5] He may also be identical with the Cluvius of consular rank who was in a front seat at the drama of Caligula's assassination on 24 January 41 (T4; see *Work*),[6] but this identification remains a

[1] See Bispham in A. Cooley (ed.), *Epigraphic Landscape* (2000), 48–9.

[2] Cic. *fam.* 13.56.1; *ILLRP* 561; A. J. N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (Manchester, 1966), 109 and 133.

[3] Sp. Cluvius was praetor in Sardinia in 172 (Livy 42.9.8, 10.14), and C. Cluvius Saxula was praetor *peregrinus* in 173, perhaps for the second time (Liv. 41.28.5); the earlier praetorship would have been in 178 or 175 (Broughton, *MRR* 1. 397 n. 4; see now Briscoe, *Comm.* 4. 146–7). In *c.*104 BC a C. Cluvius L.f. was honoured on Delos as proconsul, and was therefore governor of Asia or Macedonia (*Inscr. de Délos*, 4.1.1679). On the history of the *gens* in the republic see Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus* (1991), 111, with further references and bibliography.

[4] His *praenomen* remains uncertain: Groag (*RE* 4. 121, and *PIR*[2] C 1206) suggested on the basis of the names of other members of the *gens* that Cluvius' *praenomen* might have been Publius, and Bispham (in Cooley (ed.), *Epigraphic Landscape* (2000), 49) is inclined to accept this; on the other hand Peter printed M(arcus), doubtless because of Tac. *hist.* 2.65.1, where 'Vitellium. M. Cluvius' is the reading of the Mediccan. Ritter deleted M, as an error arising from the preceding m. 'Cluvius Rufus' is first introduced by Tacitus (*hist.* 1.8.1 = T1) without *praenomen* (so too at 1.76.1 and 2.58.2); cf. Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 318 n. 1. For full discussion, but without resolution, see Di Stefano Manzella in *Miscellanea Gasperini* (2001), 309–20.

[5] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 376 cites *CIL* 10.826 for his colleague P. Clodius, but see Groag, *RE* 4. 121.

[6] Jos. *AJ* 19.91–2 (= T4). The quotation in the last line is adapted from Homer, *Il.* 14.90–1: σίγα, μή τίς τ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν τοῦτον ἀκούσῃ | μῦθον (cf. also *Od.* 14.493).

matter of dispute.[7] There can be little doubt that the consular of 41 was a member of the same family, although the manuscripts read *Κλούιτος* (full text) or *Κλαύιτος* (epitome); at F4a *Κλαύδιος* is transmitted. He could have been a grandson of the Cluvius favoured by Octavian; and a man consular in 41 might still have been alive even at the end of Vespasian's reign; a *nobilis* consul before 41 could have been born as late as AD 8, as Wiseman points out.[8] Nonetheless, Wardle's doubts about the identity of the consular with the historian, based on their probable ages, are cogent.[9] It is possible that Josephus attached the rank anachronistically to the historian, and that he reached it only later,[10] but the simplest solution is still to distinguish the historian, active so much later, from the consular of 41; he might be the historian's father.

The historian was still active enough to be entrusted in 68, whether by Nero after Galba's revolt[11] or more probably by Galba himself, with an important province, Hispania Tarraconensis (T1).[12] Previously he had been conspicuous as a courtier (and if it were he who was present at the performance of 41, it may already have been in that role). Under Nero he acted as herald at the emperor's performances, both at the Neronia at Rome in 65 (he announced Nero's performance of *Niobe*: Suet. *Nero* 21.1–2) and in Greece in 66–7 (Dio 63.14.3). Certainly Cluvius was an orator and Wiseman claims that, with the Hellenic connections of the family, he may well have excelled in the display performances of epideictic oratory, quite in place at Nero's games: Hellenistic theory linked historiography closely with epideictic oratory.[13] However, the known Greek ties were commercial (see n. 2), and not necessarily relevant to the senatorial Cluvii.

Evidently Cluvius was trusted by the old military man Galba, who handed him the armed province or who (less likely) had ratified Nero's nomination to the post that Galba had been holding when he made his bid for empire; lack of military experience (T1)—and age, if he had been a consular by 41—would have made him seem even more innocuous. Tacitus seems to acquit Cluvius, for all his oratorical distinction and his wealth, of making any use of them against his peers under Nero. None other than Helvidius Priscus was a witness before the senate to integrity shown by Cluvius during the reign (Tac. *hist.* 4.43.1 = T2).

Left in his Spanish post by Galba, Cluvius swore in his troops to Otho when he heard of his accession, and was praised by the new emperor in an edict (Tac. *hist.* 1.76.1); the two men, as courtiers of Nero, will have been familiar, but that does not mean that they were on good terms. Cluvius abandoned Otho for Vitellius—at what

[7] It is favoured by Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 171; Groag, *PIR*² 1206; Feldman, *Latomus* 21 (1962), 320 n. 1 (bibliography), but doubted by Martin, *Festschr. Hosius* (1936), 54; Timpe, *Historia* 9 (1960), 474–502; and Ritter, *RhM* 117 (1972), 85–91.

[8] Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus* (1991), 111. The grant of 29 BC should have had the effect of ennobling the family, but Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 478, regards the consular of 41 as a *nouus homo*, hence born before AD 1 (so too Syme, *Tacitus*, 294 n. 2).

[9] Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 467.

[10] Syme, *Tacitus*, 294 and n. 3; in that case he would have been consul under Claudius or early in the reign of Nero. On the other hand, if Josephus is correct and valid, the consulship must have been in 39 or 40, as the consuls of the previous year are known (Syme l.c.; P. Gallivan, *Antichthon* 13 (1979), 66–9).

[11] So Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 318.

[12] Perhaps with provisional responsibility for all Spain (thus Groag, *RE* 4. 122); he sent troops to the coast in Tac. *hist.* 2.58.2.

[13] Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus* (1991), 111, with nn. 6 and 8.

point is unclear, although Tacitus says that the news arrived at Rome immediately after the edict was issued, so it would have been early in Otho's reign. Nor is it clear how Cluvius induced his troops to follow him. The suggestion that he was forced to change his allegiance by his own men, who wanted vengeance on Galba's murderers, presupposes that they were ready to forget that Vitellius too had originally moved against Galba.[14] In spite of his prompt switch to Vitellius, fear that his loyalty was suspect (a freedman of Vitellius reported that Cluvius had issued travel warrants without inscribing the name of any emperor on them, as if he held Spain in his own right) made Cluvius leave Tarraconensis and intercept the new emperor as he processed from Lugdunum to Rome (Tac. *hist.* 2.65.1). Such fears are surprising; Cluvius had put down the Othonian procurator of the two Mauretanias while governor (little more, perhaps, than a police and diplomatic operation, and conducted from his own province: Suet. *Oth.* 7.1): he was no candidate himself, and Vespasian had not yet been proclaimed, although speculations about the attitude of the eastern legions and their successful commander must have been rife ever since Otho's death. Vitellius was another courtier, as his father had been Claudius', and he received Cluvius well: the freedman was punished, and Cluvius joined Vitellius' retinue; he was prorogued as governor of Tarraconensis *in absentia*. Without any troops left in Tarraconensis he was harmless, and it may well be that Cluvius in any case preferred metropolitan life to viceregal pomp at Tarraco. At the end of the year, Cluvius was one of two witnesses taken to the temple of Apollo for the negotiations between Vitellius and Vespasian's brother Sabinus, the other being another literary man with Campanian connections, Silius Italicus (Tac. *hist.* 3.65.2).[15] His combined intelligence, absence of unreasonable ambition, and freedom from military prestige made Cluvius valuable at crucial negotiations.

Cluvius was not sent back to Tarraconensis by the Flavians. C. Licinius Mucianus had a use for it, as something to offer to his rival Antonius Primus (Tac. *hist.* 4.39.4). Cluvius stayed at Rome, perhaps attending the senate but holding no further office. The court changed under Vespasian (Tac. *ann.* 3.55.4–5). The entourages of Titus and Domitian were fast and disreputable, but they belonged to a new generation. Cluvius completed his historical work and discussed events of 68 with Verginius Rufus, a man in retirement and embarrassing to the new dynasty, loyal to Nero, honoured with a second consulship by Otho, but with a military reputation and offers of the empire behind him (T3).[16]

The date of Cluvius' death is unknown; Nipperdey's conjecture that he died early in 70 is based partly on Tacitus' statement (*hist.* 4.39.4) that Spain had been left vacant by his departure (*discessu*), when in fact he was allowed to govern in absence, and partly on the fact that Helvidius Priscus offered Cluvius *laus* in the course of the senatorial attack on the *delatores* (4.43.1: Nipperdey was presumably taking the praise to be something of a commemorative oration). Hence Nipperdey emended '*discessu*' in

[14] Cluvius forced by troops: Godolphin, *AJPh* 56 (1935), 326.

[15] Bardon (*Lit. inconnue*, 2. 167) regards this as having 'prit parti pour les Flaviens'; Groag (*RE* 4. 122) reasonably sees him as Vitellius' second, Silius Italicus as Sabinus'.

[16] Townend, *Latomus* 20 (1961), 337–41, and B. Levick, *RhM* 128 (1985), 318–46 (bibl.), discuss Verginius' reputation.

the second Medicean to '*decessu*' ('by his death').[17] That view is unacceptable, even to those who do not share Mommsen's opinion that Cluvius' entire work was written in Vespasian's reign, and the laudatory comments of Helvidius do not favour it: their context is the attack on informers and the reference too casual.

Peter, relying on two passages of the younger Pliny (*epist.* 2.1.2 (=T3b), where Verginius Rufus is said to have read verses and *historiae* concerning himself, and 9.19.5 (=T3a)), thinks that he did not long survive into the reign of Vespasian;[18] but the passages are hardly conclusive. C. Marius Marcellus Octavius Publius Cluvius Rufus, suff. 80, might be his daughter's son; that idea would be more plausible if Cluvius were taken for the consular of 41.[19]

Work

Three main problems have emerged from discussions of Cluvius' work. The first is whether it was the source of Josephus' account of the assassination of Gaius Caligula. The second, Cluvius as a source of later accounts of the year 69 and of Tacitus' *Annals*, is more complex and is related to problems concerning Pliny the Elder and Fabius Rusticus. The third concerns the content and merits of his work.

It is uncertain when Cluvius composed his historical work (referred to in Pliny *epist.* 2.1.2 (T3b), where Peter accepted *historiae* as including Cluvius). In T3a Verginius and Cluvius discuss their content, perhaps before they were in general circulation.[20] Some scholars have held that Cluvius wrote the greater part under Nero,[21] while others put them as late as the end of Vespasian's reign.[22] If Cluvius began writing before the death of Nero it is uncertain whether he found it necessary to rewrite after the fighting was over; publication would have to wait until the outcome was settled.

The starting point of Cluvius' work is unclear. Tacitus refers to him in F2 as if he were a familiar source, so he must already have been mentioned in the missing section of book 11 or earlier.[23] There is nothing in the Tiberian books, and nothing to support Charlesworth's view that the limits 'may plausibly be reckoned from the death of

[17] Nipperdey, *Emendationes historiarum Taciti* (Jena, 1855), 13. Having emended the MS '*discessu*' to '*decessu*', i.e. Cluvius had now died, he tartly defended himself against Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 319 n. 7 and 321 n. 2 (the history written under Vespasian, and Tac. *hist.* 2.102 an attack on Cluvius); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 377 also rejected Nipperdey's view. It is interesting that although the origins of Cluvius and Helvidius were very different, they came from neighbouring areas, the Cluvii from Campania, Helvidius from Cluviae among the Carricini Infernates in northern Samnium (Chilver, *Comm.* on Tac. *hist.* 4.5); the name Cluvius is found at Allifae (*CIL* 10.2395).

[18] Peter 2. clxvi.

[19] *PIR*[2] M 305, suggesting that this man is connected with P. Cluvius Maximus Paulinus (*PIR*[2] C 1204a), suff. towards the end of Hadrian's reign and another possible descendant of the historian.

[20] Townend (*AJPh* 85 (1964), 370 n. 71) holds that Cluvius is informing Verginius of his intention to contradict him; the present tense does not preclude that the work was still being composed. And we cannot be sure that Cluvius had not already ascertained Verginius' own impression of events.

[21] So Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 256, cf. 253, with publication at the beginning of Vespasian's reign; but cf. Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 776 n. 3; Ritter, *RhM* 115 (1972), 88.

[22] Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 776; *RE* 4. 123.

[23] Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–8; Syme, *Tacitus*, 289–90; Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 478. Manni (*Introduzione allo studio della storia greca e romana*[2] (1959), 181) thinks of Nero and the events of 68–9; Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 58, suggests that he began with the disorders of the triumviral period.

Augustus to the accession of Vespasian',[24] or Norden's that he is the source for Josephus' account of the defrauding of a Jewish proselyte in 19.[25] More depends on whether Mommsen's view is accepted, as it is by most scholars,[26] that Cluvius was the source for Josephus' account of the change of emperor in 41.[27] That view does not depend on whether the consular at the theatre in 41 was the historian, for a son might have told the story about his father, but there has been correlation between believing that he was and holding that Cluvius was Josephus' source. If Cluvius was the source, his work may also have included at least part of the reign of Gaius, perhaps going back to the end of another historian's narrative.[28]

As Peter argued (2. clxviii), Josephus tells the story, which has little to do with his theme, at unnecessary length. The mention of Cluvius in this narrative, with its stress on the government of Rome, was in Peter's view not to be explained except on the hypothesis that it was his work that was being drawn on. Particular grounds for accepting Mommsen's hypothesis,[29] and so for including it among the fragments, are set out by Wiseman.[30] Josephus' main source quotes Cluvius as an eyewitness (T4), shows a marked interest in theatrical matters (94–5), and takes the same view of Gaius' incest (204) as Cluvius took of Nero's (F3). Finally, the strong rhetorical element in the passage has been noted; Cluvius was a capable orator (T1 and T2, cf. Tac. *hist.* 2.65.1 (*orationibus*)).[31]

Not all these points are equally cogent. Rhetoric is not exclusive to this passage of Josephus, while the views taken of Gaius' and Nero's incest are simply conventional. There are also points to be made against Cluvius as Josephus' source. Ritter is one of the few scholars who are sceptical, although his own interpretation of the passage, as a hostile reference to one senator who acted as a herald at imperial shows in conversation with another, is not plausible.[32] But the very mention in Josephus of

[24] Charlesworth, *CAH* 10. 867.

[25] E. Norden, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 31 (1913), 641, on Jos. *AJ* 18.81–4.

[26] See Feldman, *Latomus* 21 (1962), 320 n. 3; Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 809–10. Doubts were expressed by A. Degrassi, *I Fasti consolari dell'impero romano* (Rome, 1953), 11; Syme, *Tacitus*, 287; Scherberich, in his survey (*Klio* 83 (2001), 136) notes J. von Destinon, *Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus* (Kiel, 1904) as advocating several sources and H. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seine Archäologie* (Leipzig, 1879), 151–3, oral sources such as the Jewish actor of Jos. *uita* 3 and 16. Scherberich argues, 142–5, that differences in evaluating the role of Chaerea and his relations with Vinicianus, as well as other discrepancies, demonstrate that there was more than one source, including a monograph on Chaerea.

[27] Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 320; assassination *AJ* 19.1–200; accession 212–73. Hölscher, *RE* 9. 1985, adds other 'Roman' items that might be ascribed to Cluvius (though at second hand): 18.32–3, 96–105, 143–239; 19.201; 20.145–57; he concluded, implausibly, that Cluvius also handled the reign of Augustus. *Contra*: Clason, *Tacitus und Suetonius* (1870), 38–9; Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 4. 351.

[28] Gercke, *JbKPh* suppl. 22 (1896), 261; Klingner *MH* 15 (1958), 204. The view of Clason, *Tacitus und Suetonius* (1870), 38–9, that it began with Nero's reign, has been taken up only by Manni (see n. 23).

[29] He was followed by Schemann, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1887), 51–2; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 378; Groag, *RE* 4. 121; Peter 2. clxviii; Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 810, for the view that the anecdote came from a personal recollection of the author. Martin (in Homel (ed.), *Festschr. C. Hosius* (1936), 21–58) demurred.

[30] Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus* (1991), 113.

[31] Charlesworth, *CHJ* 4 (1933), 116; Syme, *Tacitus*, 287; Feldman, *Latomus* 21 (1962), 327.

[32] Ritter, *RhM* 115 (1972), 87–9, reading *Ταλθύβιος* or *Θαλθύβιος*. His argument is that the passage, which ends with a line of Homer (see n. 6), begins with another Homeric allusion: the senator is 'a Talthybius'—that is, a herald (Talthybius was Agamemnon's herald in the *Iliad*—1.320, etc.).

Cluvius' rank as a consular is untoward if the anecdote came from his histories, and strange if the historian is intended at all: whatever the original source wrote, one might have expected Josephus to revise the allusion to make it clear that the story came from the contemporary historian. It is only if the consular Cluvius was (say) the father of the historian that the allusion is natural and might be still be ascribed to Cluvius' histories.

There are other possible candidates, such as Seneca the Elder, Aufidius Bassus, Pliny the Elder, Servilius Nonianus, and Fabius Rusticus; as Feldman also noted, the anecdote, oral in origin, may have been related by another historian used by Josephus; Feldman suggests Aufidius Bassus.[33]

A minor point may be worth considering. The source is rightly concluded to be Latin because of the pun on *lupus* (wolf)/Lupus (name) at 19.270–1. The man whose cowardly death is particularly noted by Josephus, Julius Lupus, prefect of the praetorian guard, was a kinsman of the Flavians; Titus' daughter (Flavia) Julia, his great-niece, was known by his *nomen*. It is surprising that the anecdote should have been included in a history written under the Flavians. But Josephus included it in the work he published in 93/4 (*AJ* 20.264). The explanation for this may be that when Josephus was writing the *Antiquities*, Julia was dead (before 90), her uncle M. Arrecinus Clemens (cos. 73), a connection of Lupus, had been killed, and another of her relatives at court, Julius Ursus, had been removed from the Prefecture of the Guard to innocuous distinction in the senate as a consular (suff. 84).[34] Domitian's perspectives were different from those of Vespasian and Titus. Josephus' material might have come from oral tradition or from a pre-Flavian source (Aufidius Bassus or Servilius Nonianus).

The conclusion of the histories[35] is relevant to the controversy over the main sources of Tacitus' *Histories* and Plutarch's *Lives of Galba* and *Otho*, for resemblances between their accounts of the years 68–9 can be attributed to Plutarch's dependence on Tacitus,[36] or to their dependence on a single source, Cluvius, Pliny, or Fabius Rusticus, whether directly or indirectly.[37]

[33] Feldman, *Latomus* 21 (1962), 329–30. For authors canvassed by scholars, see Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 481–2; Timpe (*Historia* 9 (1961), 474–502) expresses a high opinion of the author, who is Tacitean; he thinks (500) of Fabius Rusticus, noting the kindly treatment given to Aemilius Regulus of Seneca's Corduba (*AJ* 19.17 and 19); so too Feldman 329.

[34] Julia: *PIR*^{2} F 426; Arrecinus: A 1072, with Suet. *Dom.* 11. Ursus: *PIR*^{2} I 630. Stemma, after Townend, *JRS* 61 (1971), 62; Levick, *Vespasian* (London, 1999), xxiii. Lupus and Ursus: Syme, *RP* 7. 559 n. 61, 653 .

[35] See the survey in Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 477 n. 64.

[36] Clason, *Tacitus und Suetonius* (1870), 20, arguing against Cluvius Rufus, concludes that Plutarch depends on Tacitus, but used another source for *Galba* 1–22; Nipperdey and (with the common source) Borenius, *De Plutarcho et Tacito* (1902; v. Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 315) argued that Plutarch wrote before Tacitus, and included items not in Tacitus: they used the same main, if not one single, source (306–7); Hardy, *Studies* 1 (1910), 310–14, offers sixty-five instances of additional information provided by Plutarch; Schanz–Hosius 2^3. 630, agree that the relative copiousness of Plutarch disproves his dependence on Tacitus.

[37] Clason, *Plutarch und Tacitus* (1870), 3–4, gives the early history of this problem, continued by Borenius, *De Plutarcho et Tacito* (1902), ii–iv. Schanz–Hosius 2^3. 630, offer another continuation, with Cluvius as a source at 629; but cf. 647 (he ended with Nero). Peter 2. clv, finally declared *non liquet*. Latin: Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 320.

On this Peter argued (2. clii) that, since Cluvius is cited by Plutarch and Suetonius on the same topic, Otho's use of the name 'Nero',[38] he had already been exploited by the 'common source'. A case for Cluvius has been made by a number of scholars.[39] His ignorance and even trepidation in military matters is one factor (Groag described the common source as a layman), but it is a feature shared by other Roman historians and does not do more than exclude Pliny.[40] The problem remains, and it is clear that Tacitus at any rate used a number of sources for his account.[41] But of the writers who have been canvassed as the one used by all of the extant accounts, Rusticus seems by elimination to have the best claim.[42] Certainly, references to Cluvius in the *Histories* are not all flattering. The admission of fear and dissimulation at 2.65.1 certainly makes Cluvius an implausible written source for the account of his approach to Vitellius at Lugdunum, as he is for his own prompt betrayal of Otho at 1.76.1.[43]

Admittedly, there is an obvious case in these passages (and others, e.g. *hist.* 2.58.2) for holding that Cluvius continued his account to include the reign of Otho. However, they may have occurred in a Neronian context stressing Nero's posthumous popularity in certain circles.[44]

There is a real objection to Cluvius' continuation to the death of Vitellius and the end of the civil wars: that Tacitus, in relating the discussions of December 69 between Flavius Sabinus and Vitellius, does not rely on Cluvius, who was present, but on *fama*; the point of view is that of a comparatively distant spectator (Tac. *hist.* 3.65.2).[45] This

[38] Plut. *Oth.* 3 (F4a); Suet. *Otho* 7.1 (F4b: by implication in authors mentioned as *quidam*); cf. Tac. *hist.* 1.78.

[39] Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 40–1; Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 318–25; Nissen (*RhM* 26 (1871), 498, 507–10) thinks of Pliny, dependent on Cluvius; *contra*: E. Beckurts, *Zur Quellenkritik des Tacitus, Sueton. und Dio* (Brunswick, 1880), 67; while Gercke (*JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 237–73) makes Cluvius secondary to Pliny; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 173–83.

[40] Fabia (*Sources de Tacite*, 178–81) rejected Cluvius, as there is no firm evidence that he was used in Tacitus' *Histories*, which in Fabia's view had the same chief source for all the surviving sections. F4a, citing Cluvius by name, rather shows he was not Plutarch's main source: Plutarch makes no effort to show that he is especially worth citing because he was governor of Spain. F4b presents the same material without citation: both took it from the common source (which, if that was Fabius Rusticus, implies that he wrote later than Cluvius). Godolphin (*AJPh* 56 (1935), 326), arguing that the unmilitary man, forced by his troops to change his allegiance from Otho to Vitellius and afraid of the governor of Mauretania, was the source of Plutarch's thesis in *Galba* that unruly soldiers were the cause of the catastrophes of 69. Layman: Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 777–85.

[41] *Contra*: Hardy, *Studies* 1 (1910), 321–3. Baier (*Tacitus und Plutarch* (1893), 23–9) implausibly argues for Vipstanus Messalla, writing a Sallustian monograph.

[42] Rusticus: Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 764 n. 1, 775; Syme, *Tacitus*, 180–1, 675. Pliny has supporters: so Nissen, *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548 (arguing that the narrative has a 'Gallic' colouring); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 199–209; Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 159–262; Hardy, *Studies* 1 (1910), 327–9; Momigliano, *Nono contributo*, 180–1; Townend, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 337; *Hermes* 92 (1964), 471; at *AJPh* 85, 344–5, he rebukes Nissen for insisting on a single source (Pliny) and Groag (*JKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 709–98) for discovering plurality underlying every page of Tacitus. For Cluvius as the common source, see n. 39, with Godolphin, *AJPh* 56 (1935), 324–8.

[43] See Chilver, *Comm.* ad loc. So already Hardy, *Studies* 1 (1910), 326–7.

[44] Thus, Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 181; Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 775; Syme, *Tacitus*, 675. Mommsen (*Hermes* 4 (1870), 320) argued that Cluvius' account went down to the death of Vitellius; cf. Groag, 776; Nipperdey–Andresen on Tac. *ann.* 11–16 (6th edn., Berlin, 1908), 27; Peter 2. clxviii; and many others. Townend (*AJPh* 85 (1964), 347 and 371) sees the end as hailing the accession of Vespasian; cf. Tac. *hist.* 2.101; 3.86.

[45] Nipperdey–Andresen on Tac. *ann.* 11–16 (6th edn., Berlin, 1908), 28; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 176, 179, 378; Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 776 n. 3.

objection is dealt with by Bardon, not satisfactorily, as it leaves Tacitus failing his audience at a moment of high drama: in his view the term *fama* aims to recreate the atmosphere at Rome, not to provide a point of reference.[46] This would have been a hard period for the former Vitellian partisan to treat under Vespasian, while the death of Otho would have made a rather downbeat ending if read under the Flavians.

Finally, Fabia's suggestion[47] that Cluvius' *Histories* went no further than the end of 68 is attractive; they would then fit exactly with the commencement of the *Histories* of a writer who respected Cluvius' work (see below).[48]

When Cluvius published is correspondingly controverted—assuming that he published the work as a whole and that publication means something more than the circulation of a work among a few intimates. Where Baier held that the work on which Tacitus drew for his civil-war material could not have appeared before the reign of Nerva or of Trajan, Ritter accepts publication in the Flavian era.[49] There is no problem for those who hold that the history ended with the death of Nero or the end of 68.

It is clear that Cluvius' work was extensively used, evidently by Tacitus in dealing with the reign of Nero (F2–3), and Plutarch (F1 if not F4a), probably by Suetonius and Cassius Dio,[50] conjecturally by Josephus. Hence discussion has also focused on the use of the works of Cluvius, Pliny, and Fabius Rusticus in Tacitus' *Annals* and by Suetonius and Dio for the Claudio-Neronian period. Allowing for the presumed scope of each author's work, scholars have argued on the basis of specific references to them (which might indicate that they were not in use elsewhere); peculiarities in the material that recall particular interests of those historians; and the political and personal bias that may be ascribed to them. According to Townend,[51] Cluvius exercised 'immense influence' on subsequent generations, being irresistible to Dio, while Tacitus used him with caution, although following his lead in his whole interpretation of the sexual and political conflicts of Nero's middle years;[52] Fabia and others have gone as far as regarding him as the principal source for the last part of the

[46] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 168 (taking Cluvius to the death of Vitellius); Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 56, agrees, arguing that the omission shows only that Tacitus chose not to use Cluvius as a source at this point. But Tresch is right to insist (57) that the absence of Cluvius' name from the chapter on responsibility for the sack of Cremona does not prove that he was not being used.

[47] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 171–81. So Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 253, with Cluvius offering summary treatment of the civil wars (252), and having the Flavians burn the Capitol (250); E. Manni, *RFIC* 24 (1944), 124, is sceptical of his having written of the civil wars. Seeck (*RhM* 56 (1901), 231) suggested it ended with Vitellius' entry into Rome; Syme (*Tacitus*, 179) offers the death of Nero or the end of 68; cf. Groag, *RE* 4. 123.

[48] So Baier, *Tacitus und Plutarch* (1893), 9.

[49] Baier, *Tacitus und Plutarch* (1893), 10–11; Ritter, *RhM* 115 (1972), 88, citing Timpe, *Historia* 9 (1961), 490–1, 499, 501–2.

[50] Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 322–3 (Dio perhaps with an intermediate source; he draws attention to the figure of 50,000 casualties at the fall of Rome in Jos. *BJ* 4.653 and Dio 64.19.3); like Schiller, *Nero* (1872), 23, Mommsen regards Cluvius as the leading source for Suet. *Claud.* and *Nero*; *contra*: Clason, *Tacitus und Suetonius* (1870), 27 and 51. For 68–9 see Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs*, 28–9 and Mommsen, 323. Charlesworth, *CHJ* 4 (1933), 118 n. 34, dissents from Momigliano's view (*Quinto contributo*, 810) that Cluvius is the common source for sensational parts of Suetonius and Dio.

[51] Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 248. He regards *hist.* 1.1, on *malignitas* passing for *libertas*, as a reference to Cluvius.

[52] Townend, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 372.

Annals.[53] Schiller held that Suetonius used him in the biography of Nero, while Peter reserved judgement.[54] An attempt to show the dependence of the *Octauia* on Cluvius has won no favour.[55]

This question is relevant to the political tendency, tone and seriousness, and overall merits of Cluvius' work. First, Cluvius' judgement of Nero.[56] Gercke regarded Cluvius as hostile,[57] but safe as long as he did not publish the work he was writing; nor did he allow dislike to prevent his putting Nero in a good light, especially for the 'good' period of his reign. Josephus complains that some writers were still too favourable to Nero, which presumably means that they fell short of the thoroughgoing damnation that was de rigueur under the Flavians, while others were excessively hostile.[58] Even then, evidently, shades of opinion were possible, and the material could be slanted one way or another. Given that Nero's reign was deplorable for the most part, others were involved and share the blame. Cluvius, having been quite closely associated with Nero, might well take the line either that he had some good qualities, or that he was led astray.[59] This last is certainly found in F3: the initiative for incest is taken by Agrippina, and Nero is terrified.

The weight to be attached to Cluvius' achievement has given rise to sharp controversy. On the one hand is Cluvius' own famous anticipation of objections from Verginius to the role assigned him in the *Histories*, that Verginius was aware of the scrupulousness (*fides*) that history demanded. This claim is reported by Pliny in a serious context and must be taken seriously,[60] suggesting that his work took a high moral standpoint.[61] Thus Peter held[62] that Cluvius maintained the same golden mean in his writing as he did in life, in particular in his attitude to Nero; he had the good fortune of being a frequent witness of events which he examined coolly.

[53] Clason, *Tacitus und Suetonius* (1870), 8–10; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 179–80 and 402–4; Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 230–1, saw him as second to Pliny.

[54] Schiller, *Nero* (1872), 23–4; Peter 2. clxviii.

[55] G. Nordmeyer, *JbKPh* Suppl. 19 (1893), 278–81.

[56] See Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 476 n. 61, noting Townend's view of him as extremely hostile.

[57] Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 256–7 (so Klingner, *Röm. Geisteswelt*[3], 485: *recentibus odiis*); anti-Flavian: 244, cf. Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 776 n. 3. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 63, recommends caution: 'Cluvius habe seine Dienstfertigkeit gegenüber Nero bagatellisiert.' Gercke also identified Cluvius as the source of Josephus' account of Nero in the *Jewish War*, and Charlesworth (*CHJ* 4 (1933), 116) concluded that he delivered the same moral verdict on Nero as he had on Gaius: young men corrupted by absolute power.

[58] Jos. *AJ* 20.154, with Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 255–6, taking it as a reference to Cluvius (cf. Tac. *ann.* 15.38.1). Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 62, takes *ann.* 14.9.1; 15.45.3; 60.3 as alluding to Cluvius and Rusticus as *quidam* who moderate the charges against Nero.

[59] Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (1918), 399, says that Cluvius was 'assai benevolo riguardo a Nerone, ma non aveva risparmiato Claudio representandolo come un debole'. If Josephus followed Cluvius' account of Nero's accession, it is noteworthy that, unlike Pliny *nat.* 22.92, he eschewed the story of Agrippina's poisoning of Claudius in *BJ* 2.248, and has it only in *AJ* 20.152.

[60] This fits Syme, *Tacitus*, 276, characterizing Cluvius as one of his 'consular historians'.

[61] Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 295–325, is favourable, asking (307) if the work was a 'Zeitgeschichte' as described by Gell. 5.18.2. Groag, *RE* 4. 124, extols Cluvius, though acknowledging that for him the court was central (in the detailed account of Josephus, *AJ* 19 the senate comes off badly: 167, 244, 228, 250; so Charlesworth, *CHJ* 4 (1933), 116). Noè, *Storiografia imperiale*, 105, credits him with 'moderazione', effectively citing him as a man whom Tacitus could quote along with others (F3); cf. 134, following Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.2. 115, and Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli annales*[2], 161: 'con la renuncia a una linea spregiudicata e strumentale'.

[62] Peter 2. clxvii.

A highly unfavourable assessment was built up by G. B. Townend. Starting from the appearance of the Homeric line in Josephus *AJ* 19.92 (T4), he identified 'Cluvian' passages by such use of Greek; Wiseman is sympathetic to this hypothesis, and explains the habit as due to Cluvius' Hellenic background.[63] The Greek quotations occur in passages hostile to emperors, and tone itself became another criterion.[64] Cluvius was unmilitary, prone to gross exaggerations of casualty figures; his work was anecdotal, limited in scope, and scandalous; and lacking a strong chronological framework,[65] very different from that of the sober Pliny the Elder.[66] Indeed, his history-writing was motivated in part by being expelled by Gaius from the consulship of 39, and denigrated Nero's court to justify Vespasian to a hesitant populace.[67]

The bases of these hypotheses and the overall picture are all shaky.[68]

In general, cautious minimalism is in place. We do not know when Cluvius was consul, and it is uncertain whether or not he is the source of Jos. *AJ* 19.91–2 (T4). He did collaborate with Nero in his indecorous stage performances, though not in attacks on senators. Having something to defend did not lead to his being savage against Nero (F3); F4, on Nero's continued popularity, is consistent with his taking a moderate line, even redressing the uniformly black opinion that the Flavians favoured. Writing a history of the reign so soon after the event was a delicate operation, given the numerous individuals who had compromised themselves, including some now in positions of influence. In his own case he could plead a combination of necessity and the fact that by accepting a position close to the emperor he was able to exercise a restraining influence.

Tacitus did not treat Cluvius as in any way an eccentric writer, but once chose to follow him with others against Fabius Rusticus (F3). And the same spirit would have led to his producing precisely the story that the paragon Verginius Rufus, contrary to later orthodoxy, had remained loyal to Nero.[69] The story of Nero ended in mid-68; Cluvius may have ended his account there, or, better, at the end of the year, with Galba apparently in control and no need for revelations about Flavian plans. Omitting the Year of the Four Emperors would have spared him reporting on the interview between T. Flavius Sabinus and Vitellius, to whom he had been close. He produced an account of Nero's regime, examining court politics, and was put right in some respects by Fabius Rusticus.

[63] Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus* (1991), 113–17.

[64] Townend, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 98–120 (on Suetonius); cf. *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48 (on Dio); *AJPh* 85 (1964), 337–77; *Hermes* 92 (1964), 467–81; *CQ* 22 (1972), 376–87 (*Schol. Juv.* 5.109). For the impact of Townend's work, see Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 466 n. 1.

[65] Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 106; 92 (1964), 473.

[66] The contrast was stressed by Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 260–1, with Pliny writing on the same period (the death of Gaius to the death of Vitellius) after Cluvius had published, to give a wider focus.

[67] Townend, *Hermes* 89 (1961), 234–5; *Hermes* 92 (1964), 478–9. His work is included in those criticized by Josephus *AJ* 20.154 and Tacitus *hist.* 1.1 (Townend, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 346).

[68] Criticisms: Griffin, *Seneca*, 429 n. 2 ('a slender thread'); Wiseman, *Flavius Josephus* (1991), 111–18; Wardle, *Hermes* 120 (1992), 466–82.

[69] Syme, *Tacitus*, 179, but cf. Townend, *Latomus* 20 (1961), 338. Godolphin, *AJPh* 56 (1935), 328, held a view advocated by P. A. Brunt, *Latomus* 18 (1959), 539, that Verginius had allowed his troops to get out of control. Flavian orthodoxy, reflected in the wording of Verginius Rufus' tombstone, was that he had put down a rebellion along nationalist lines. Bessone, *Aevum* 52 (1978), 100–1, reviews the theories and holds that Cluvius criticized the whole tenor of Verginius' conduct, not one episode.

Pliny's version of events was nearly contemporary but he may have had Cluvius' history available; the tendency of his own work was unmistakable: he filled a gap that Cluvius had left, not only in lauding the Flavians but perhaps also in giving a fuller account of military and provincial matters (as his fragments suggest).

We have included as testimonia only those passages that relate to Cluvius as a historian and orator. The fragments are arranged in order of the events to which they allude.

(BML)

85

T. Flavius Vespasianus (Imperator Caesar Vespasianus Augustus)

Editions: Peter 2. cxxxxiii–cxxxxv, 108.

Principal discussions: Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893); W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian* (Berlin, 1921), esp. 107–8, 123–5, 136; R. Weynand, 'T. Flavius (206) Vespasianus', *RE* 6 (1909), 2623–95; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 420, 432; Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres* (1940), 271–2; A. Stein, *PIR*² (1943), F 398; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 209–10; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 178; 297; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984), esp. 120–4; R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 640–5; D. Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle* (1999), 108–10; B. Levick, *Vespasian* (London, 1999).

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Vespasian, a new man from Reate in the Sabine country, was born on 17 November, AD 9. His paternal forebears went back to a centurion on the Pompeian side at Pharsalus who, pardoned by Caesar, took up the profession of debt collector. His son, Vespasian's father, T. Flavius Sabinus, may also have reached the centurionate or leading centurionate before undertaking collection of the 2.5 per cent tax on goods entering or leaving the province of Asia; later he became a moneylender among the Helvetii, where he died. Sabinus married up: Vespasia Polla's family was eminent at Nursia, and her father reached the ranks of *praefectus castrorum* and *tribunus militum*. Her brother held the praetorship and may have helped his nephews, another Sabinus and the younger Vespasian, into the senate (though Vespasian was said to be reluctant).[2] After a slow start he distinguished himself in Claudius' invasion of Britain in 43, held the consulship for the last two months of 51, and went on to govern Africa.

Nero chose Vespasian in 67 to deal with the rebellion in Judaea, and his campaigns were chronicled by Josephus as well as in his own memoirs, to which Josephus had access.[3] Josephus, born 37/8, was a high-born Jew and priest and politician. Involved in the rebellion of 66, he was appointed to defend Galilee but was trapped in Jotapata and captured; from then on he acted as an adviser to Vespasian and Titus and was

[1] Sources in *PIR*² F 398; chronological outlines in Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*, 108–10; discussion in Levick, *Vespasian* (1999).

[2] See Suet. *Vesp.* 1.2–2.2.

[3] See Jos. *BJ* 2.1–4.584; Levick, *Vespasian* (1999), 29–39, with bibliography.

released from captivity and made a Roman citizen.[4] He wrote the history of the rebellion first in Aramaic, then published the seven books of his account in Greek in the second half of Vespasian's reign, although there are sections that have suggested that they belong to the principate of Domitian or at least were revised then.

Vespasian took over at Antioch, perhaps at first as governor of Syria pending the arrival of Licinius Mucianus, by 1 March 67. His first objectives were to conquer Galilee and to secure control of the Mediterranean coastal strip, while the last campaign that Vespasian conducted seems to be assigned by Josephus to May 69. He set out from Caesarea to deal with parts of Judaea and Idumaea and took control of the road into Jerusalem from the north, approaching the city itself for the first time; after this he returned to Caesarea. Josephus makes this the moment when he heard of Vitellius' victory. His chronology is hard to follow, presumably because it is disingenuous. Possibly the last short campaign, undertaken when Vitellius' victory was known, was accompanied by the preparations of Titus, Vespasian's son and legate, and Mucianus, for the declaration of Vespasian as emperor at the beginning of July.

This was the date he celebrated as the beginning of his principate. His troops took Rome at the end of the year, and he arrived there, after some months in Alexandria and a tour through the East, in the early autumn of 70. The rest of his reign was spent in Italy, and he died near his birthplace on the night of 23 June 79.

Work

Vespasian presented himself rather as Gaius Marius had, as a simple countryman; consciously or not, he retained his Sabine accent.[5] His educational qualifications have been doubted, but native wit stood him in good stead and he was a good orator, even in Greek, and quoted Homer.[6] He is well known as a supporter of literature, and as a scourge of philosophers,[7] but his only known composition is a memoir, ὑπομνήματα, that is, *commentarii* (T1–2). The work dealt with the war in Judaea, and was evidently published.[8] That is the sum total of our certain knowledge, incorporated in the two testimonia and one fragment; all else is speculation.

Commentarii were analysed by A. von Premerstein, with too much rigour, into two kinds, useful notes on a subject, and memoirs. He put Vespasian's work into the first.[9] However, the obvious immediate model for his work is the memoir of Cn. Domitius Corbulo (82 F1–3).[10] In addition, Corbulo had been forced by Nero to kill himself in 67, and Vespasian took the place he might have had in the Jewish War. Justification was needed. But another earlier contemporary, a rival of Corbulo for fame, and among

[4] See Jos. *uita*; *PIR*[2] F 293; S. J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (Leiden, 1979); P. Bilde, *Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (Sheffield, 1988); T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (2nd edn., London, 2002) (bibliography).

[5] Suet. *Vesp.* 22. [6] Greek: Tac. *hist.* 2.80; Suet. *Vesp.* 23.1; cf. Aur. Vict. 9.1.

[7] Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 432.

[8] See Peter 2. cxxxxiii; A. von Premerstein, *RE* 4. 757–8; Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 640, suggests *commentarii de bello Judaico*.

[9] Premerstein, *RE* 4. 757–8; F. Bömer, *Hermes* 81 (1953), 236, seems to take the same view as Premerstein of Vespasian's work; cf. also E. M. Wightman in B. Levick (ed.), *The Ancient Historian and his Materials* (Farnborough, 1975), 98–9, and esp. Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 640–5.

[10] Tac. *ann.* 15.16.1–3 (=82 F2).

the most distinguished generals of the age, was C. Suetonius Paullinus (83), who also wrote memoirs.[11] Vespasian was putting himself into the highest company. Considered as an emperor who wrote memoirs he followed Augustus (60), whose *De uita sua* was largely concerned with his campaigns, Tiberius (73), and Claudius (75), but inasmuch as his military success was a justification for his claim, not least in constrast to Nero, Otho, and Vitellius, his work is likely to have been close to that of the military writers.

There are other, interrelated, problems concerning the work's scope and purpose. It is not clear when Vespasian published; whether he also wrote up his part in the British campaigns of 43–7; whether his was a purely military memoir or included apologetic political material, and whether it was all his own work rather than a collaboration between him and Titus, who commanded the campaign in Judaea during 70 and (at least at a distance) until he left for Rome in the early summer of 71.

The question of collaboration with Titus can be briefly dealt with.[12] The theory rests solely on what Josephus says about authors' claims to be familiar with *τοῖς τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων ὑπομνήμασιν* (T2). Bardon scouts the idea that this was a slip of the pen, and suggests that there were two works, Titus writing up the war, and Vespasian his own rise to power, justifying it.[13] There is no evidence for this specific division of labour, but Titus may have wanted to commemorate his own achievements in Judaea, which continued after Vespasian had retired to Alexandria and then to Rome, and culminated in the capture of Jerusalem. That would explain Josephus' plural.[14] If Titus did write his own memoir (of the campaign of 70?), it would perhaps have been prefaced with accounts of earlier campaigns in which he was legate of XV Apollinaris. But this is highly speculative.

The question then arises of how far Vespasian took his memoirs. Did he follow his own career as he made his way back to Rome, or the fortunes of the war under Titus? He might have preferred not to dim the glory of Titus' success, though it was won under his auspices. A convenient stopping point would be December 69, with his recognition at Rome and during the lull before Titus took up the war again, with the narrative extending from his appointment to Judaea until his own active campaigning ceased.[15]

As to the date of publication, as Peter points out, Josephus showed his own work to Vespasian and Titus soon after 75; it looks as if Vespasian was writing soon after the war on material he had collected during it. If the story did not continue beyond Vespasian's participation in the war, it could have been composed during his stay in Alexandria in the winter of 69–70 and spring and summer of 70. Gutschmid, on the other hand, argued for about 75 at the earliest as the year of publication:[16] his argument is that since Josephus showed his work to Vespasian and at the opening inveighs against earlier writers, Vespasian could not yet have published. This

[11] Ibid. 14.29.2.

[12] Peter 2. cxxxiii, dismisses this view of Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 4. 411.

[13] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 210.

[14] See Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 641, postulating publication late in the reign of Vespasian.

[15] Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian* (1921), 107, but taking the narrative to the triumph of 71; Syme, *Tacitus*, 178: 'not perhaps going beyond the military record of his own campaigns in Judaea.'

[16] Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 4. 346.

hypothesis is unnecessary, if one takes the modest word *commentarii* seriously; Josephus did not hesitate to attack rival historians long after that work had appeared (*vita* 336–7). Besides, Vespasian was neither one who took no part in the action nor was he merely one of those who were present. No reader would take his personal memoir to be under attack.

The scope and tenor of the work are harder to estimate, especially as the most straightforward narrative can carry a message. Bilde treats the work as 'a kind of unedited counterpart to Caesar's works about the wars in Gaul',[17] which may give it too little credit for care and art. Given Josephus' own picture of a man reluctant to accede to power, Vespasian is likely to have presented himself as a plain soldier, outraged by Vitellius' misconduct and compelled to intervene.[18] There is no evidence for Vespasian's inclusion of the British campaign, which is unlikely to have figured. The two campaigns were totally unrelated; from 43 to 47 Vespasian was only a legionary legate, winning himself a pair of priesthoods and a consulship, but one held at the very end of 51. It was hardly comparable with the campaign in Judaea, and not easily combined with it in a single work.

Finally, there is the question of the use of the work by later writers, and what passages in later writers should be considered as potential fragments. One extreme position is that of Weber, who held that it was the Latin source that he maintained underlay the work of Josephus; that extreme claim was immediately countered by Laqueur.[19] It is not possible to say how extensively Josephus used it, as he only once cites him for a particular item (F1), though passages where he claims to represent Vespasian's thought processes may be near the mark.[20]

According to Peter,[21] traces of the memoirs are to be found in Tacitus' *Histories*, notably his account of the 'asphalt lake' (the Dead Sea) at 5.6, the territory of Sodom, 5.7, the prodigies observed before the fall of Jerusalem, 5.13; they are reminiscent of passages of Jos. *BJ*, respectively 4.476–82, 483–5; 6.288–309; he argues plausibly that Josephus himself is not the source,[22] but it is unlucky for source critics that Josephus is unlikely to have inserted anything at all into his work that was unacceptable to Vespasian and his sons. Peter supports his case by arguing that observations of this kind were made by Corbulo, Licinius Mucianus, and Suetonius Paulinus.[23] Then there is Pliny's *Natural History*, which has several passages about the asphalt lake: 2.226 (*nihil in Asphaltite Iudaeae lacu . . . mergi potest*); 5.71–2 (*nullum corpus animalium recipit, tauri camelique fluitant; inde fama nihil in eo mergi*); 7.65 (*quin et*

[17] P. Bilde, *Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (Sheffield, 1988), 62.

[18] Jos. *BJ* 4.601–4. Noè (*Storiografia imperiale*, 122–3) is very 'political' in her interpretation of the memoir, probably rightly; but she is wary of following Weber. She regards Vespasian's memoir as being close to Augustus' (123).

[19] R. Laqueur, *PhW* 41 (1921), 1105. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian* (1921), 136, concludes 'dass der Josephischen Erzählung zugrunde liegenden Werk die commentarii . . . sind, die gleich den commentarii Caesars . . . aus den einzelnen Bericht jener Memoiren ausgearbeitet worden sind'; 196 (the same true of Titus' memoirs: 236.)

[20] e.g. *BJ* 4.591: anger against Nero balanced by thoughts of the distance to Rome.

[21] Followed by Schanz–Hosius 2⁴. 432.

[22] Peter 2. cxxxviii, against H. Lehmann, *Claudius und Nero und ihre Zeit* 1 (Gotha, 1858), 33–4.

[23] He cites with approval D. Detlefsen's refutation (*Philologus* 34 (1876), 43–4) of H. Nissen's claim (*RhM* 26 (1871), 541) that Tacitus' knowledge of the Jews in *hist.* 5.2–3 came from Pliny's *A fine Aufidi Bassi*, which in turn was derived from Mucianus.

bituminum lenta natura . . . certo tempore anni supernatans) with verbal coincidences between this and Tacitus (*certo anni bitumen egerit*).

As far as the asphalt-lake passages go, Peter seems at first sight to have made out a good case, though he does not classify the passages mentioned above as fragments. Vespasian and his investigations are actually mentioned and the reference to menstrual blood certainly links Tacitus and Josephus; however, the fact that Tacitus distinguishes older writers from those who have inspected the area is far from decisive. There must have been many visitors to it, only too anxious to tell their tales. The scepticism of Chilver–Townend on this point seems justified.[24] As to Pliny, he has nothing to say of Vespasian's experiment, mentioning only animals as failing to sink. Nor does Pliny list the emperor as one of his sources, which he would hardly have failed to do.

Again, although the adjoining topographical descriptions in Josephus and Tacitus, of Sodom and its neighbourhood, also show verbal resemblances (on famous features of the local landscape), there is here no reference to Vespasian. Moreover, Tacitus' account imposes his own interpretation on the material more than it might have done if he were using such a high authority as Vespasian would have been. As to the prophecies before the fall of Jerusalem, they relate to the success of Titus, and the prophecies should have come rather from a memoir written by him. Yet in any case the Jerusalem-prophecies passage is strongly oriented towards Jewish beliefs.

(BML)

[24] G. E. F. Chilver, G. B. Townend, *Hist. Comm. on Tac. Hist. IV–V* (Oxford, 1985), ad loc. See already Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 254; at 255 n. 1 he rejects Vespasian as the source, which he thinks should be very recent.

86

Vipstanus Messalla

Editions: Peter 2. clxviii–clxviiii, 115–16.

Principal discussions: H. Nissen, 'Die Historien des Plinius', *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548, at 536; C. Baier, *Tacitus und Plutarch* (Frankfurt a.M., 1893); Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 231–2; S. Gsell, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien* (Paris, 1894); E. Groag, 'Zur Kritik von Tacitus' Quellen in den Historien', *JhKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 709–98; P. v. Rohden, H. Dessau, *PIR*[1] (1898), V 468; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 607; M. Treu, 'Antonius Primus in der taciteischen Darstellung', *WJA* 3 (1948), 241–62; E. Paratore, *Tacito* (Rome, 1951; 2nd edn., 1962); A. Briessmann, *Tacitus und das flavischen Geschichtsbild* (Wiesbaden, 1955), 46–68; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 207; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958); R. Hanslik, 'Vipstanus (6) Messalla', *RE* 17A (1961), 170–2; B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian* (London and New York, 1992).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Vipstanus Messalla[1] was of high descent on his mother's side, for he could probably trace his lineage back to the Valerii Messallae of the republic, and so to the distinguished orator and historian of the Augustan age (Messalla Corvinus, no. 61).[2] He was military tribune temporarily commanding the 7th Legion Claudia in 69, and served in the expeditionary force of Antonius Primus which was led on Vespasian's behalf against Vitellius in Rome (T1–3). Early in 70 he courageously spoke up in the senate for his uterine brother M. Aquilius Regulus (T4), a notorious evil-doer.[3] As he was not yet of an age to hold the quaestorship Peter calculated his birth-year at little after 45, Hanslik in 46 or 47: Syme assigns his quaestorship to *c.* 74.[4] He also figures in Tacitus' *Dialogus*, which has a dramatic date of 75,[5] expounding the reasons for the decline in eloquence. His old-fashioned stance for the classical orators was not well received (*dial.* 32).[6] Peter thought that, in accordance with the convention that living persons were not assigned roles in such works, Vipstanus must have been dead when the dialogue was published (but that is now thought to be as late as 101 or 102[7]), and Syme pointed out that he is absent from the Flavian record, although he should have reached the consulship in about 84.

[1] Scholars are divided between Messalla and Messala; the Mediccan MS fluctuates, but inscriptions support the first, to which we adhere throughout.

[2] Syme, *Tacitus*, 101, 107 n. 3, 615.

[3] *PIR*[1] (1933), A 1005; Syme, *Tacitus*, 101.

[4] Syme, *Tacitus*, 108.

[5] R. H. Martin, A. J. Woodman, *OCD*[4] 1426.

[6] For his role (14.1; 16.4–23; 6; 25.1–26.9; 28.1–32,7; 33.4–35.5) see Syme, *Tacitus*, 105–6.

[7] Martin and Woodman, loc. cit. (n. 5).

Works

Messalla was highly regarded by Tacitus, his friend, according to Syme,[8] as a participant of unique integrity in the struggle between Vespasian and Vitellius (T1). No mention is made in the *Dialogus* of Vipstanus' historical work, and it should therefore be assigned to the period after 75. The form, scope, and size of the work are alike unknown, but it is taken seriously as a source for the Flavian–Vitellian war;[9] certainly Syme saw 'no harm in making him the principal and preferred source for the campaign of Cremona'.[10] It could have been a memoir rather than a formal history or monograph,[11] and, given the divergence from Pliny, possibly written to correct inaccuracies in existing accounts of the campaign.

(BML)

[8] Syme, *Tacitus*, 177.

[9] Baier, *Tacitus und Plutarch* (1893), 23–4, including the entire wars of 68–9; Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 785–6, probably rightly, admitted only the Flavian phase; he, like Briessmann (below), ascribed favourable Tacitean judgements on Antonius Primus to Messalla. Treu (*WJA* 3 (1948), 241–62) considered him a leading source of Tac. *hist.* 3, especially the judgements on Flavian leaders, and wrote of a 'Messallatradition', 251; and Briessmann, *Tacitus und das flavischen Geschichtsbild* (1955), 49–54, saw him as an opponent of the Flavian version, with the great theme the struggle of Primus for order against his unruly troops (53).

[10] Syme, *Tacitus*, 177, citing Paratore, *Tacitus* (1951), 574; cf. 2nd edn. (1962), 297 n. 10, appendix 3, 629–51.

[11] '*Commentarii*': Paratore, *Tacitus*[2] (1962), 631. Daybooks: H. R. Graf, *Kaiser Vespasian* (Stuttgart, 1937), 52, 56.

87

Fabius Rusticus

Editions: Peter 2. clxii–clxv, 112–13.

Principal discussions: H. Nissen, 'Die Historien des Plinius', *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548; D. Detlefsen, 'Über des älteren Plinius Geschichte seiner Zeit und ihr Verhältnisse zum Tacitus', *Philologus* 34 (1876), 40–9; A. Gercke, *Seneca Studien* (Leipzig, 1895), 159–272, esp. 262–72; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 380–4, 400–3; E. Groag, 'Zur Kritik von Tacitus' Quellen in den Historien', *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 709–98, esp. 777–85; A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900); O. Seeck, 'Der Anfang von Tacitus' Historien', *RhM* 56 (1901), 227–32; C. E. Borenius, *De Plutarcho et Tacito inter se congruentibus* (Helsinki, 1902); N. Feliciani, 'L'anno dei quattro imperi', *RSA* 11 (1907), 3–33, esp. 17–25; A. Kappelmacher, 'Fabius (140) Rusticus', *RE* 6 (1909), 1865–7; E. Hardy, 'Plutarch, Tacitus, and Suetonius, on Galba and Otho', in *Studies in Roman History* 1 (Oxford, 1910), 294–333; M. Lehnerdt, 'Ein verschollenes Werk des älteren Plinius', *Hermes* 48 (1913), 274–82; E. Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), 387–434; A. Momigliano, 'Osservazioni sulle fonte per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone', *RAL* Ser. 6, 8 (1932), 293–336 (=*Quinto contributo*, 799–836); Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 648; W. Otto, 'Zur Lebenszeit des C. Plinius Secundus', *Philologus* 90 (1935), 483–94; A. Stein, *PIR*[2] (1943) F 62; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 203–4; R. Syme, 'Deux proconsulats d'Afrique', *REA* 58 (1956), 236–40; F. Klingner, 'Tacitus und die Geschichtsschreiber des 1 Jahrhunderts n.Chr.', *MH* 15 (1958), 194–206 (=*Röm. Geisteswelt*[4] (1961), 469–89); Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), esp. 60–1, 179–80, 288–94; D. Timpe, 'Römische Geschichte bei Flavius Josephus', *Historia* 9 (1960), 474–502; G. B. Townend, 'Some rhetorical battle-speeches', *Hermes* 89 (1960), 98–120; G. B. Townend, 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89 (1961), 227–48; Questa, *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales*[2] (1963), esp. 146–90, 203–4; R. Hanslik, 'Plinius der Ältere', *AAHG* 17 (1964), 65–80, esp. 65–7; G. B. Townend, 'Cluvius Rufus in the "Histories" of Tacitus', *AJPh* 85 (1964), 337–77; R. M. Ogilvie and I. A. Richmond (eds.), *Cornelius Tacitus De Vita Agricolae* (Oxford, 1967); J. M. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher in den Annalen des Tacitus* (Heidelberg, 1965), 59–63; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 219–21; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976), esp. 427–40; R. Syme, 'Minor emendations in Pliny and Tacitus', *CQ* 30 (1980), 426–8 (=*RP* 3 (1984), 1233–5); G. B. Townend, 'Tacitus, Suetonius, and the temple of Janus', *Hermes* 108 (1980), 233–42; Noè, *Storiografia imperiale* (1984).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Fabius Rusticus probably came from Spain. Not only was he a friend of Seneca (F2) of Cordoba, but the name occurs in inscriptions of Baetica.[1] The date of his birth cannot be estimated from any magistracy; indeed, he is not known to have been a

[1] *CIL* 2.1070; 2015=*ILS* 1354a (Singilia Barba, Antonine).

senator, although he secured some kind of advancement from Seneca. Peter's birth-date of about 30,[2] based on Rusticus' friendship with Seneca, might well be too high. Possibly he was Rusticus the addressee of Pliny *epist.* 9.29 (between 106 and mid-108), who is a literary critic respected by Pliny, but Rusticus is a common name and there are too many other candidates for this item to be admitted to the testimonia.[3] It was long assumed that Rusticus was still alive in 108, as he seemed to be named among the beneficiaries of the 'Testamentum Dasumi' (T4).[4] But it is likely that the man there was a son or other younger kinsman, for he is ranked low in the will for a man of his age and standing: he is next to a person called by the Greek, perhaps libertine, name of Acanthus.[5] It is possible, however, that Rusticus is mentioned, and in a way that implies he was alive at the time, in a passage of Quintilian (T3) which belongs near the end of Domitian's reign and which, after lauding earlier historians of the principate up to Nonianus and Aufidius Bassus, celebrates an unnamed rising literary star.[6] We have printed these passages as 'possible testimonia' (T3–4).

Works

The date of Rusticus' work is uncertain, and it is not known if he wrote more than one. Peter, believing that the literary critic of Pliny *epist.* 9.29 was indeed Rusticus, thinks that he concentrated his efforts (but in any case Pliny is discussing genres here, and that does not preclude more than one historical work).[7] As to the date, it has been suggested that Agricola's discoveries in Scotland about the shape of the land mass, mentioned in Tac. *Agr.* in the context of Livy's and Rusticus' accounts (F1), prove that Rusticus wrote before 83, but scholars rightly doubt this.[8] In the *Agricola* Rusticus was renowned for his eloquence, but in the *Dialogus* Tacitus makes M. Aper

[2] Peter 2. clxii.

[3] See Sherwin-White ad loc., and, for the date, 41. He cites Syme, *Tacitus*, 179 and 293, and Kappelmacher, *RE* 6. 1865–6, as inclined to accept the identification; Stein, *PIR*[2] F 62, was non-committal.

[4] For discussion of this document, see R. Syme, *Chiron* 15 (1985), 41–63 (= *RP* 5. 521–45), identifying the testator with Domitius Tullus and invoking the will of Pliny *epist.* 8.18. So C. Castillo García, *Actas I Congreso Andaluz de Estudios clásicos* (Jaén, 1982), 159–60; W. Eck, *ZPE* 30 (1978), 277–95, had concluded for an unknown testator. The fragment of the stone published in *AE* 1976, 77, removes Tacitus and Pliny from the will, loosening any connections between them and Rusticus. For the position of Rusticus (the son) in the will see J. Matthews, *Roman Perspectives* (Swansea, 2010), 150.

[5] Macé, *Essai sur Suétone*, 370–1, thinks of a son, claiming inconclusively, against Mommsen and others, that Rusticus died between 92 and 98, on the grounds that he could not have been more than twenty-five years younger than Seneca and would have been 87 in 109; he also argues that the praise of Quintilian in T3 (written *c.*92) suggests a man of advanced age, and that Tacitus would not have criticized him as he does in F1 (written 98) if he were still living. This is far from compelling, and different conclusions have been drawn from those passages. A freedman Acanthus: *ILS* 7389.

[6] Quint. *inst.* 10.1.104 (= T3). The argument is that there was no reason why Quintilian should not have mentioned Pliny and Cluvius if he admired them, for they were both dead at his time of writing, while Tacitus had not begun his historical work; that leaves Rusticus as the obvious candidate. Quintilian was not an admirer of Seneca's style but Peter regards it as unlikely to have affected Rusticus' historical writing enough to have damaged Quintilian's regard for it. This seems highly speculative.

[7] Peter 2. clxii: *in uno omnem operam posuisset.*

[8] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 380; Kappelmacher, *RE* 6. 1866; Peter 2. clxii; Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 648; doubt: Townend, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 343 n. 16; Griffin, *OCD*[4] 564. Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (1918), 399 n. 3, suggests 75–7 for publication.

refer only to the eloquence of Servilius Nonianus (79 T2) and Aufidius Bassus (78 T5). That gives support to Peter's assigning the publication of Rusticus' work to some time after the dramatic date of the *Dialogus*, 74–5.

The date of the composition of Rusticus' history is relevant to the question of how it relates to the works of Pliny the Elder and Cluvius Rufus. Pliny may have been the earliest to complete his work, before the publication of the *Natural History* and ending with the triumph of 71, but he may have had Cluvius available. Rusticus came later, to judge by the way Tacitus (and possibly Quintilian) speak of him. There was room for him to differ over the reign of Nero and the Year of the Four Emperors, notoriously so over the role of Seneca in the early part of Nero's reign, and a gap in the market giving scope for *eloquentia*.

The scope of Rusticus' work is sharply controverted. All the fragments concern the reign of Nero. Hence Townend holds that it is going beyond the evidence to credit Fabius even with a full history of Nero;[9] the only argument in favour of the view that his work was on a larger scale is that Rusticus lived long enough to cover events later than the death of Nero. The passages in the *Annals* where he is cited (F2–3) refer strikingly to the conflict for power under that emperor, with Fabius' patron Seneca as the central figure, terminating probably with the Pisonian conspiracy as a grand climax. Indeed, Townend thinks of a monograph on the model of Sallust:[10] if the attack on Seneca's exactions in Britain were indeed Cluvius' and appeared in the early years of Vespasian's reign, Fabius might well have felt it necessary to answer the charges at some length; hence his interest in the geography of the island. But this narrow view of Rusticus' work is surely unacceptable, when Tacitus refers to him in the same breath as Livy, and the scope of the scanty fragments offers no secure basis for Townend's hypothesis. The description of Britain makes it attractive to believe that he included the reign of Claudius, whose invasion of 43 would provide the prime occasion for a general description.[11] The earliest possible date for the beginning is the reign of Gaius, with Rusticus continuing the work of the elder Seneca, as Pliny became the continuator of Aufidius Bassus.[12] As to the terminal date, some opinion has seen him as the author onto whose work Tacitus' *Histories* abutted.[13] Alternatively he is credited by Groag and Syme with being the 'common source' of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Plutarch for the civil wars (see introduction to Cluvius Rufus (no. 84), where this view is favoured).[14]

[9] Townend, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 343; cf Gercke, *JbKPh* Suppl. 22 (1896), 271; Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 60, is also critical. Townend adds (n. 16) that if Fabius' work was an answer to Cluvius', some weight may be attached to the lack of reference to Fabius in the *Dialogus*, whose dramatic date becomes the *terminus post quem*.

[10] Townend, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 343. Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 63, warns against allowing Rusticus a monopoly of goodwill towards Seneca, or overriding goodwill. E. Champlin, *Nero* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003), 42, thinks of a 'martyrology'.

[11] So Schanz–Hosius 2⁴. 648, pointing out, however, that the reign of Nero also presented opportunities (Boudicca's revolt of 60); so Tresch, *Die Nerobücher* (1965), 59.

[12] Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 4. 351; Kappelmacher, *RE* 6. 1866; followed by J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Gaius* (Oxford, 1934), 223.

[13] Seeck, *RhM* 56 (1901), 227–32, and see Peter 2. clxiii. Mommsen, *Hermes* 4 (1870), 301 and 317 n. 3, notes Tac. *hist.* as a continuation of one or more sets of *annales*.

[14] Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 764 n. 1, 771–7; Syme, *Tacitus*, 180–1, 675–6.

Rusticus was clearly read and exploited, not only in Tacitus' Neronian books, but also in Suetonius' biography.[15] Townend's objection follows that of Nissen,[16] also arguing for Pliny, and rests on the close use that Tacitus made of it, with verbatim quotation shared by Plutarch:[17] Rusticus was still alive when Tacitus was composing his histories, and his literary property could hardly be treated in this cavalier way. But, as we have seen, it is by no means certain that Rusticus survived until 108. Tacitus was free to exploit his work and, while continuing to admire its eloquence, to differ from it.

The quality of Rusticus' work, as literary composition, is highly praised by Tacitus (F1), but the fact that his account may on occasion have been compromised by his friendship with Seneca is noted. To Tacitus' praise Peter adds that offered by Quintilian to the unnamed author of T3.

As to Rusticus' hostility to Nero, and probably to Claudius, who had allowed Seneca to be exiled, it is rightly stressed by Ciaceri as a determining factor in his work.[18] But Ciaceri is too schematic: being a partisan of Seneca did not make Rusticus one of Agrippina. Both were victims of Nero, but had begun as political opponents. In any case, partisanship of Seneca was not a guarantee of repute in Flavian times or under Nerva and Trajan. Seneca could be seen as having made the Neronian regime possible, and his style certainly fell out of favour.[19]

Taking Tacitus' admiration for Rusticus further, against the views of Gercke and Fabia, who held that Tacitus rated Rusticus below Cluvius and Pliny,[20] Peter went on to argue along with Seeck[21] that Tacitus avoided the Julio-Claudian period because a writer of integrity (without *ira et studium*) had already dealt with them, but on Rusticus' death near the beginning of the second century he was able to tackle the Flavians and became the author of an *a fine Fabi Rustici*, Rusticus having ended with the arrival of Vitellius in Rome. As Peter regarded Cluvius's histories as not passing beyond the reign of Nero and as his *facundia* finds no mention in the *Dialogus*, he is excluded. As to the criticism of Rusticus in T2, that he is too partial to Seneca, Tacitus uses that as a peg on which to hang his account of his own method of enquiry. Even Gercke had to admit that Tacitus followed Rusticus for his account of the death of Seneca (F4). It follows from this argument that Rusticus' work did in fact cover the Julio-Claudian period and was a source for Tacitus before he reached Nero's reign. For this there is no evidence.

To sum up, Fabius Rusticus may have been very young when he owed advancement to Seneca, not necessarily in any post that would have led to a senatorial career. He never forgot his debt and repaid it, to the detriment of Claudius and Nero, repeatedly in his historical work, which was no mere monograph but a full-scale history of the

[15] Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (1900), 82; 264; 366, citing §§28 (sexual licence) and 35 (the incest).

[16] Nissen, *RhM* 26 (1871), 497–548; *contra*: Groag, *JbKPh* Suppl. 23 (1897), 790.

[17] e.g. Tac. *hist.* 2.49.4 and Plut. *Otho* 18.1.

[18] Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (1918), 399–400 and n. 3.

[19] Griffin, *Seneca*, 7, 427–44; B. Levick, *SLLRH* 3 (1983), 222–5.

[20] Fabia, *Sources de Tacite*, 400; Gercke, *Seneca Studien* (1895), 262–3, denying (though largely on the basis of association with Seneca and his style) that Quint. *inst.* 8.15.18 can refer to Rusticus. For an exiguous contribution of Rusticus to Tac. *ann.*, see Ciaceri, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (1918), 422–5.

[21] Seeck, *RhM* 56 (1901), 228; Rusticus' ending: 231. Seeck concedes the possibility that this admired author might be Cluvius.

reign of Nero, and probably of Claudius' as well. It was written in part to supplement and correct the histories of Cluvius Rufus and Pliny and probably appeared in the later part of the reign of Domitian. The rhetorical brilliance noted by Tacitus won it instant acclaim, and as we have seen it may have been hailed by Quintilian before it was finally published, although its partisanship made it vulnerable to criticism. Tacitus, when he began the *Histories*, considered the Julio-Claudian period to have been dealt with; perhaps their composition showed him that he could outdo Rusticus in the literary field. The Julio-Claudian dynasty alone provided the material he needed, and Tacitus could widen the scope of the history of this period too, including the Augustan background.

Its recent authority may have made it the main source for Tacitus' and Plutarch's accounts of the Year of the Four Emperors, and there was no reason why Rusticus could not have continued until the death of Vitellius. Unflattering facts revealed about the conduct of Cluvius Rufus during those months (his prompt desertion of Otho; his concealed fear of Vitellius) add piquancy to this hypothesis.

(BML)

88

Q. Junius Arulenus Rusticus[1]

Editions: Peter 2. clxxii, 116.

Principal discussions: W. Kroll, 'Iunius (149) Rusticus Arulenus', *RE* 10 (1917), 1083–4; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 650, 832, 856–7; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 207–8; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958); R. S. Rogers, 'A group of Domitianic treason trials', *CPh* 55 (1960), 19–23; L. Petersen, *PIR*[2] (1966), I 730; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 210–11; Syme, 'A political group', *RP* 7 (1991), 582–5.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Rusticus, a man of senatorial antecedents[2] whose family probably came from Cisalpine Gaul,[3] was tribune of the plebs in AD 66, and, as a supporter of the rights of the senate strengthened by Stoic principles, was ready to veto the *s.c.* condemning Thrasea Paetus to death (T1);[4] Thrasea was a principled politician who had been ready to collaborate with Nero at the promising beginning of his principate but who had shown his disapproval of the murder of Agrippina in 59 and been excluded from recent imperial ceremonies; his life and work are discussed in the introduction to no. 81. Rusticus was praetor in 69 and member of a delegation sent by Vitellius to the advancing Flavian forces, and was wounded (Tac. *hist.* 3.80.1–2). It was not until 92 that he reached the consulship (suffect). He had written of Thrasea (T2, T3) but probably not, as Suetonius claims (T3), of C. Helvidius Priscus, Thrasea's son-in-law, who had perished in Vespasian's reign.[5] He was executed after proceedings in the senate the following year;[6] his writings were burnt (T2) and his brother Mauricus and other kin and friends were exiled (Pliny *epist.* 5.1.8); Rusticus' death supposedly haunted Domitian (Dio 67.16.1). After his death M. Aquilius Regulus published a pamphlet attacking his memory (Pliny *epist.* 1.5.2). Pliny redressed the balance (*epist.* 1.5.2; 1.14.1; 2.18.2, claiming to have been close to Rusticus during his youth), and a son or grandson (suff. 133), taught Marcus Aurelius.[7]

[1] *Fasti* of 92 have Q. Arulenus Rusticus, and are the only evidence for the *praenomen*: see A. Degrassi, *I Fasti consolari dell'Impero romano* (Rome, 1953), 28.

[2] *PIR*[2] (1966) I 813.

[3] Syme, *Tacitus*, 559 n. 1. Paetus came from Patavium.

[4] See ibid. 298: 'The notice is probably Tacitus' way of hinting at his source'; with n. 4: 'Rusticus may have had access to memoranda by Thrasea justifying his policy.' He also draws attention to *ann.* 13.49.4: *rationem poscentibus amicis.*

[5] Peter 2. 116; *PIR*[2] (1966) H 59; cf. Pliny *epist.* 1.5.2; T4.

[6] Rogers, *CPh* 55 (1960), 19–23, pleads for 'treason' as the charge rather than objectionable writings, misunderstanding the nature of the charge and of the evidence.

[7] *PIR*[2] (1966) I 814.

Work

Peter (2. clxxii–clxxiiii) treats Rusticus as a member of a group, in the sense that each sought in various ways to celebrate the memory of imperial victims, also including Herennius Senecio (89), C. Fannius (93), Cn. Octavius Titinius Capito (95), Pliny the Younger (see Appendix 1, A31), and Ti. Claudius Pollio (91); even so their work, as far as it is known, seems heterogeneous. Senecio wrote an extended biography, Fannius and Capito on (Neronian) deaths, Pliny perhaps expressed his opinion in speeches, Pollio wrote on a Flavian senator. No other writings of Rusticus are known than his treatment of Thrasea. We cannot be certain that it was a full biography: T4 could refer to oral assertions[8] and seems to differentiate Rusticus' statement on Thrasea from Senecio's biography of Helvidius. The hagiographic work referred to in T2 could have been a memoir, reminiscences, or some kind of panegyric (Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio all focus on Rusticus' praise of Thrasea), but a full or partial biography still remains a likely option.

(BML)

[8] Note the use of the imperfect ὠνόμαζε. On the other hand his reported description of Thrasea as 'sacred' (ἱερόν) surely recalls Suetonius' *sanctissimos* (T3), where a published work of Rusticus is clearly indicated.

89

Herennius Senecio

Editions: Peter 2. clxxii.

Principal discussions: R. Gaheis, 'Herennius (44) Senecio', *RE* 8 (1912), 678; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 650–1, 832, 856–7; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 208; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 76, 83, 177, 298 n.; R. S. Rogers, 'A group of Domitianic treason trials', *CPh* 55 (1960), 19–23; L. Petersen, *PIR*^{2} (1966), H 128; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 425–6, 444–7; S. H. Rutledge, *Imperial Inquisitions* (London, New York, 2001), 130–2.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Herennius Senecio of Baetica shared the convictions and the fate of Q. Iunius Arulenus Rusticus (no. 88). Unlike Rusticus he declined a senatorial career (Dio 67.13.2) after his quaestorship (in Baetica, T1). However, he was a distinguished pleader, defending a man accused of incest with the chief Vestal (Pliny *epist.* 4.11.12). In 93 he supported his friend Pliny's prosecution of Baebius Massa, a former governor of Baetica, who attacked him in turn for *impietas* (disloyalty) (T1).[1] His unwillingness to seek office and his biography of C. Helvidius Priscus, the son-in-law of Thrasea Paetus and praetor in 70 who perished under Vespasian,[2] were the complaints against him brought, after 23 August 93, by Mettius Carus (T2).[3] After his death he was attacked by M. Aquilius Regulus.[4]

Work

See Arulenus Rusticus (no. 88). Senecio wrote at the request of Fannia, Helvidius' widow. Copies of the multi-volume work were burnt (T3). Fannia saved it (T2) but nothing survives, and no other writings are known. Something of the nature of the biography can be divined from the fact that Senecio wrote with the help of Helvidius' papers (T2); he will have dealt with the principles that lay behind Helvidius' conduct, which not all approved. The salient features as they have come down to us are his exile

[1] See Syme, *Tacitus*, 76, for Massa (*PIR*^{2} B 26) charging Senecio with treason; *contra*: Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 446, who has Massa charging Senecio with *impietas* in the sense of failure of duty to a client (he also notes that Massa was disqualified from bringing prosecutions). It is hard to see how the malice of which Massa accuses Senecio and the particular form it took could be represented as dereliction of duty towards the client; Sherwin-White is answered by C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 134–5.

[2] *PIR*^{2} H 59.

[3] *PIR*^{2} M562; Tac. *Agr.* 2.1; 45.1; Pliny, *epist.* 3.11.3; Dio 67.13.2.

[4] *PIR*^{2} A 1005; Pliny *epist.* 1.5.3, and see on Vipstanus Messalla, no. 86.

after the condemnation of Thrasea (Tac. *hist.* 4.6); his greeting Vespasian by his name as a *privatus* and ignoring him in his edicts as praetor; his attack on the Neronian delation (Tac. *hist.* 4.6–9); and his insistence on attending the senate (here he differed from Thrasea), and disputing with Vespasian even though Vespasian asked him to stay away (Suet. *Vesp.* 15; Dio 66.12); they imply the doctrine of a governing senate which determined policy and elected the emperor, and which it was every senator's duty to support. The biography will have belonged to the tradition established by memoirs and biographies of Cato the Younger. It influenced Tacitus, to judge by his presentation of him, whether or not it defended him against criticism. Another, hostile, tradition survived and emerges in Suetonius and Dio.

(BML)

90

P.(?) Vibius Maximus

Editions: Peter 2. clxxi.

Principal discussions: P. v. Rohden, H. Dessau, *PIR* 3 (1898), V 389; W. Keil, 'Vibius Maximus und Florus', *PhW* 39 (1919), 1075–80; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 205; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 210–11; P. White, 'Vibius Maximus, the friend of Statius', *Historia* 22 (1973), 295–301; K. M. Coleman, 'Vibius Maximus and the writing of history', *PICA* 16 (1982), 25–7; R. Syme, 'Correspondents of Pliny', *Historia* 34 (1985), 324–59 (=*RP* 5 (1988), 440–77); K. M. Coleman, *Statius, Silvae IV* (Oxford, 1988), 195–209.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The historian Vibius Maximus[1] was a friend of Statius, who sent him his *Thebaid* before publication in 92 and dedicated a Sapphic ode to him (*silu.* 4.7). The poem urges him to return from his native Dalmatia,[2] where he has recently fathered a son (lines 29–32), so that he can help Statius with his *Achilleid* (21–4). We also learn that he had held the equestrian post of *praefectus alae* in Syria (46). White argues from Statius' deferential attitude to Vibius (esp. 25), and his relief that he has fathered a child (33–40), that Vibius was approaching middle age in 94 (the probable date of the poem).[3] This conclusion enabled White to suggest that Statius' friend and adviser was P. Vibius Maximus, an *eques Romanus* from Epitaurum (Cavtat) in Dalmatia, listed as a witness on a military diploma of AD 71.[4] This identification was accepted by Syme,[5] and if correct would rule out the once standard view that Statius' friend was C. Vibius Maximus, prefect of Egypt from 103 to 107 but subsequently disgraced.[6] It would also exclude another C. Vibius Maximus, who was prefect of an auxiliary cohort in Dalmatia in 93 or 94.[7] There are in any case strong grounds

[1] H. Nohl, *Hermes* 12 (1877), 517, established the reading Vibium in place of the transmitted readings (see apparatus to T1).

[2] White, *Historia* 22 (1973), 298, correctly infers from *silu.* 4.7.13–20 that Dalmatia must have been Vibius' birthplace; see also Coleman 202, on 4.7.17–20.

[3] White, *Historia* 22 (1973), 298; Coleman on Stat. *silv. IV*, 196 (and see xxi and 95 for the date of the poem).

[4] *CIL* 16.14=*ILS* 1991; White, *Historia* 22 (1973), 299–300.

[5] Syme, *Historia* 34 (1985), 327–8, revising his earlier position (see next note).

[6] Thus e.g. von Rohden, Dessau, *PIR* V 389; Syme, *Historia* 6 (1957), 480–7 (=*RP* 1. 353–60); R. Hanslik, *RE* 8A. 1975–7; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (1960), 154–6. Disgrace: A. Stein, *Die Präfekten von Ägypten* (Bern, 1950), 50–3; H. Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford, 1954), 33–43, 150–60; Syme, cit., 484–5; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 210–11.

[7] *CIL* 16.38. Reasons to differentiate him from the homonymous prefect of Egypt are set out by Syme, *Historia* 6 (1957), 481–2.

for distinguishing both of the foregoing from the historian Vibius Maximus, Statius' addressee.[8]

Work

It was not only for his *dignitas* but for his *eloquentia* that Statius esteemed Vibius (T1). At the end of *silu.* 4.7 he refers to Vibius' historical efforts (T2). He seems to have composed a handbook of world history (*mundi senium*) for the benefit of his son, which Statius praises by saying that it combines the qualities of Sallust and an author described as 'the foster-child of the Timavus', who can only be Livy.[9] Statius' use of the word *senium* recalls the ages of world history (cf. Seneca Maior 74 F2 with comm.). Coleman rightly rejects the widespread notion that Vibius composed an epitome of Livy,[10] since Livy's work covered only the history of Rome (and Sallust's only part of that). She notes that the combination of Sallust and Livy cannot therefore refer to content, and concludes that 'Vibius wrote a simplified world history, combining the conciseness of Sallust with the clarity of Livy, so that the young could receive moral instruction from the lessons of the past'.[11]

(BML, TJC)

[8] Clearly set out by Coleman on Stat. *silv. IV*, 195–7, whom we have followed closely.

[9] The Timavus (mod. Timavo) is a river of north-east Italy linked in the epic tradition with Patavium (Padua): Virg. *Aen.* 1.242–8; Luc. 7.193–5; it is therefore a poetic metonymy for Livy's native city. Livy is also described as an *alumnus* of Patavium by Quintilian 8.2.1. On all of this see Coleman, *PACA* 16 (1982), 27 n. 2; on Stat. *silv. IV*, ad loc.

[10] Thus e.g. W. Keil, *PhW* 39 (1919), 1080; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴. 315; E. Opelt, *RAC* 5. 948.

[11] *Statius, Silvae IV*, 208. She adds that selectivity of material, *breuitas* in a different sense from the Sallustian, 'is an ideal embraced by writers, especially universal historians, who concentrate on clear exposition of major themes'. Cf. A. J. Woodman, *CQ* 25 (1975), 275–88.

91

Ti. Claudius Pollio

Editions: Peter 2. clxxiiii.

Principal discussions: A. Stein, 'Ti. Claudius (275) Pollio', *RE* 3 (1899), 2842; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 651, 831; A. Stein, *PIR*[2] (1936), C 966; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 209; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (1960), 124–6, no. 54; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 440–3; H. Devijver, *Prosopographia Militiarum Equestrium* 1 (Leuven, 1970), 264–5, C 170 (bibl.).

INTRODUCTION

Life

Born *c.*49–51,[1] after equestrian commands and procuratorships (in reverse chronological order in T1, T2), from which he may have retired in about 93,[2] Claudius Pollio was chosen by Q. Corellius Rufus under Nerva to assist in land distributions. He is commended by Pliny (T2) as a former fellow soldier in Syria (about 81) to C. Julius Cornutus Tertullus. What his experience of Domitian's reign was is uncertain; he is likely to have been abroad for much of it, and, the letter makes clear, had not exploited it.

Work

In writing biography Pollio fell in with contemporary fashion (see Junius Arulenus Rusticus (no. 88) and Herennius Senecio (no. 89)), but he is rather a successor to the elder Pliny (no. 80), who composed a life of Pomponius Secundus, and so a predecessor of Tacitus in the *Agricola*, than a fellow of the Stoic hagiographers Herennius Senecio and Arulenus Rusticus. The work was certainly a eulogy, as Pliny makes clear when contrasting the author's attitude with that of most people, who only speak ill of the dead (T2.6). Pliny's recommendation hinges in part on Pollio's devotion in publishing a life of his friend, who was evidently his social superior and possibly his patron. The subject was a senator, L. Annius Bassus, legate of XI Claudia under Vespasian in the Jewish War and suffect consul in 70.[3] It is possible that in early service in the East, perhaps as a *primus pilus*, Pollio served under Bassus, to whom he

[1] Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes* (1960), 125. The family had probably obtained the citizenship only recently, not earlier than AD 43.

[2] Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 442.

[3] *PIR*[2] A 637, modified by Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 443, and cf. C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 113.

may have owed his appointment.[4] Bassus is praised in Tac. *hist.* 3.50.2; perhaps Pollio had been consulted; Bassus was a committed adherent of the Flavians, and the biography may have been composed under Domitian.[5] No other writings are known, and Pliny's letter gives the impression that this was a single excursion—'dégagé d'intentions politiques', as Bardon remarked. As with Fannius (93), Pliny gives the impression that the work is unknown to his correspondent,[6] not necessarily because of Cornutus Tertullus' lack of literary interests: it may well not have had wide circulation.

(BMI.)

[4] For this kind of patronage between senators and equestrians, see R. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge, 1982), 139–42.

[5] See Syme, *Tacitus*, 178 n.

[6] C. Iulius Cornutus Tertullus of Perge, *PIR*² I 273.

92

Pompeius Saturninus

Editions: Peter 2. clxxv.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 649, 676, 827; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 206; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 122–4; R. Syme, 'Correspondents of Pliny', *Historia* 34 (1985), 324–59, esp. 333–5 (= *RP* 5. 440–77, esp. 450–2); L. Vidman, *PIR*[2] (1998), P 650.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The dilettante Saturninus, originating perhaps in Cisalpine Gaul,[1] is often addressed by Pliny or mentioned in his letters.[2] He was an equestrian[3] jurisconsult or at least *aduocatus*,[4] perhaps 'not a *curator* put in charge of a single city, but an "adiutor" . . . to the person in authority, to Priscus' (who is mentioned in these letters).[5]

Works

Saturninus' various literary works, mentioned by Pliny (T1), included history, with special mention of the merits of the speeches. Sherwin-White comments: 'Saturninus used a composite style, akin to Quintilian's *medius modus* . . . These paragraphs might be a description of Tacitus',[6] and claims that Pliny's comments give a glimpse of the milieu in which Tacitus developed his style. Elsewhere Pliny is less demanding (5.8.4). No trace of Saturninus' historical work survives; the subject(s) and scope are alike unknown, but if it covered the same periods it was probably soon superseded by Tacitus'; it is to Pliny that we owe what knowledge we have of most of the abundant historical writing of his generation.

(BML)

[1] S. Mratschek, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 188 n. 2; Syme, *Historia* 34 (1985), 343 n. 101. Not from Cisalpine Gaul: Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 419, on *epist.* 1.8.2, and see C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 134.

[2] See Vidman, *PIR*[2] P 650. Saturninus addressed: Pliny, *epist.* 1.8; 5.21; 7.7; 7.15; 9.38; mentioned: 7.8.

[3] Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 103, not accepted by Vidman, *PIR*[2] P 650.

[4] Jurisconsult: Vidman, *PIR*[2] P 650, cites 7.7.2; 7.15.2; *aduocatus*: Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 103.

[5] Syme, *Historia* 34 (1985), 337.

[6] *Letters of Pliny*, 123.

93

C. Fannius

Editions: Peter 2. clxxiii.

Principal discussions: A. Stein, 'C. Fannius (10)', *RE* 6 (1909), 1992; F. Münzer, 'Die Entstehung der Historien des Tacitus', *Klio* 1 (1901), 300–30; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 651, 832; F. A. Marx, 'Tacitus und die Literatur der "exitus illustrium uirorum"', *Philologus* 92 (1937), 83–103; A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} (1943), F 116; H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford, 1954), 241; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 208; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958); L. Petersen, *PIR*^{2} (1966), F 128; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 320–1.

INTRODUCTION

Life

C. Fannius, known from Pliny's obituary notice of 105–6 (T1), has a resonant *nomen*. Late republican Fannii were defenders of senatorial government (C. Fannius, cos. 122 BC (see no. 12); C. Fannius, tribune 59 BC[1]); under Augustus Fannius Caepio died for *maiestas*;[2] Thrasea Paetus (no. 81) transmitted the name to his indomitable daughter, perhaps from his mother.[3] Stein suggested that Fannius was a connection of theirs;[4] at any rate he might be from Transpadane Gaul; his status is unknown.[5]

Work

Fannius wrote an account of the deaths of Nero's victims, in three books, but left the work incomplete (T1). We may presume that he concentrated on their condemnation and ends, rather than writing full biographies. No fragments are preserved, leaving us to wonder who was included, what point he reached, and how he categorized his material. Sherwin-White takes *primum librum quem de sceleribus eius ediderat* (T1.5) to refer to an early instance of 'a biographical method of writing by categories', in the manner of Suetonius. But the idea that the phrase *de sceleribus eius* refers only to the content of the first book is a wholly mistaken reading of the text. In any case, categorizing subject matter within individual lives (as Suetonius did) is different from the organization of a collection of *exitus*, all of which illustrated the same abuse of power by the princeps.[6] Either thematic organization is possible, or a chronological

[1] Broughton, *MRR* 1. 516; 2. 189. [2] *PIR*^{2} F 117.

[3] *PIR*^{2} F 118. See Syme, *Historia* 34 (1985), 324. [4] Stein, *PIR*^{2} F 116.

[5] Equestrian Syme, *Tacitus*, 298 n. 11; further connections 559 n. 1. Transpadane: Syme, *Historia* 34 (1985), 325.

[6] Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 321, with C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 134. Münzer, *Klio* 1 (1901), 311, takes the phrase *de sceleribus Neronis* to be the title of the whole work, but Bardon rightly rejects this (*Litt. inconnue* 2. 208).

arrangement, which would illustrate the development of Nero's tyranny. Pliny lauds Fannius' care; clearly style and ingenuity were vital[7] in treating well-handled material belonging to a well-established and fashionable genre.[8] Plato's idealization of the death of Socrates was an early example; τελευταί of heroes and philosophers were produced in the Hellenistic age; what gave the genre a particular impetus at Rome was the celebrated end of the younger Cato, which provided a model of action for men and women who saw themselves in both roles, and of writing for their literary admirers. Tacitus may have used Fannius as a source,[9] but it is noteworthy that Pliny assumes that his correspondent Novius Maximus[10] does not know Fannius' work, even if he claims that it was eagerly read. This could be a sign of limited circulation or of Novius' lack of interest in such writing.

(BML)

[7] For the style see Syme, *Tacitus*, 125 with n. 3. and Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 321. *inter sermonem historiamque medios* probably refers to this: he was weighty, as befitted the grave subject matter, but not ponderous.

[8] Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 320. See Marx, *Philologus* 92 (1937), 83–103; Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (1954), 236–42; Griffin, *Seneca*, 387.

[9] Schanz–Hosius, 2[4]. 651; Marx, *Philologus* 92 (1937), 83–9 argues for Tacitus' use of Fannius and other 'exitus-Literatur' in *ann.* 15–16 only.

[10] See Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 297.

94

C. Pompeius Planta

Editions: Peter 2. clxxiiii–clxxv, 116.

Principal discussions: Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 648; 830; A. Stein, *Die Präfekten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berne, 1950), 48–9; M. Lambertz, 'Pompeius (103) Planta', *RE* 21 (1952), 2283–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 204–5; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (1960), 140–1, no. 58; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 481–2, 571; R. Syme, 'Correspondents of Pliny', *Historia* 34 (1985), 324–59, esp. 333–5 (= *RP* 5. 440–77, esp. 450–2); L. Vidman, K. Wachtel, *PIR*[2] (1998), P 637.

INTRODUCTION

Life

C. Pompeius Planta[1] is attested as procurator in Lycia-Pamphylia in the mid-70s (T1), and as prefect of Egypt from 4 September 98 until at least 14 February 100.[2] The gap has made some reject the identity of the two officials.[3] Trajan then refers to him as a 'friend' (T3 and *POxy* 3022), but he had an enemy (T2), a Maximus who has been identified with a successor in the prefecture: Vibius (cf. no. 90); hence a possible professional dispute. Sherwin-White (*Letters of Pliny*, 481) rejects this on the grounds that Pliny would not have addressed letters to a disgraced official. The identification of the prefect with the man named in T2 is conjectural: would Pliny have encouraged an attack on a man who was Trajan's friend?[4] Alternatively, Sherwin-White suggested that Planta's history had criticized a Novius Priscus (cos. 78), relative of a writer Novius Maximus, whom he prefers as the addressee of T2,[5] while Guillemin ad loc. (cited by Sherwin-White) thought that Arulenus Rusticus and other heroes may have suffered in his work. Novius Priscus had some of the credentials of the heroes, if Sherwin-White is right in identifying him with the friend of Seneca who was one of those exiled after the Pisonian conspiracy (Tac. *ann.* 15.71).[6] Syme, while suggesting that Planta's work might have offended north Italians involved in the campaigns of 69 (see *Works*), preferred professional rivalry, a Maximus acting as Planta's *adiutor* in Egypt.[7]

[1] The *praenomen* is found in *ILS* 8907 and *Inscr. Side* 34.

[2] *SB* 8750, l.72; 9050; *BGU* 1. 226, l.10.

[3] See Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes* (1960), 141; too large to allow for identification, according to Stein, *Präfekten von Ägypten* (1950), 48, also sceptical on Pliny's friend as the prefect.

[4] See Lambertz, *RE* 21. 2285.

[5] Pliny *epist.* 4.20.2; 5.5.7.

[6] Novii: Vidman, *PIR*[2] N 182 (the writer); N 183 (Seneca's friend); N 187 (the consul).

[7] Syme, *Historia* 34 (1985), 334.

Works

As Planta wrote an account of the Bedriacum campaign fought in the war between Otho and Vitellius, January–April 69, it has been conjectured that he took part in it, and that he wrote a personal memoir or an account based on first-hand evidence. The Valla scholiast is almost certainly wrong to say that Planta wrote after Tacitus (F1b); it is more likely that he wrote first, and that his account was available to Tacitus, who may have used it for his *Histories*. His career under the Flavians raises the questions of how he treated the conflict (and his own role in it), and whether his narrative went beyond it on to the even more slippery ground of the second campaign of 69 in the area, between Vitellians and Flavians. As there is only the one surviving reference to the work both questions must remain open.

Only one representative inscription for Planta the official is quoted (T1; full references in *RE*, *PIR*, and Stein, *Präfekten von Ägypten* (1950), 48–9).

(BML)

95

Cn. Octavius Titinius Capito

Editions: Peter 2. clxxiii.

Principal discussions: F. Münzer, 'Die Entstehung der Historien des Tacitus', *Klio* 1 (1902), 300–30; A. Stein, 'Cn. Octavius (89) Titinius Capito', *RE* 17 (1917), 1856; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 562–3. 651, 819, 832; F. A. Marx, 'Tacitus und die Literatur der "exitus illustrium uirorum"', *Philologus* 92 (1937), 83–103; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 208–9, 221; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 92–3, 117; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes* 1 (1960), 143–5, no. 59; G. B. Townend, 'The post *ab epistulis* in the second century', *Historia* 10 (1961), 375–81; K.-P. Johne, *PIR*[2] (1987), O 62; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 210–11.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The author Titinius Capito is known from three of Pliny's letters (T3–5), but circumstantial evidence favours his identification with the equestrian official attested in inscriptions (T1–2). If so, his was a successful career, including Domitianic military decorations and *ornamenta praetoria* from Nerva, possibly, as Pflaum suggests, for help in bringing him to power (95–9);[1] he was prefect of the watch by 102 (T1–2). He was a connection of Nero's victim L. Silanus Torquatus (T3),[2] a person of high character (T5),[3] a friend of the younger Pliny, advising him to write history (T4), a refined man of letters, and a patron of other writers (T5).

Works

Peter treats Capito as one of a group of biographers, largely apologists for 'Stoic martyrs' who had suffered under the principate. No other writings of his are known. Capito's work dealt with the deaths of his heroes (T5), some Pliny's close friends (Pliny speaks of biographical *carmina* as well (T3));[4] since he kept statues of Brutus, Cassius, and the younger Cato in his house, and was given permission by Nerva to erect one of L. Iulius Silanus Torquatus in the Forum (T3, T5), it is likely that their deaths featured in the work. It has been seen as a source for *exitus* in Tacitus' *Annals*,[5] but no securely attested fragments survive.

(BML)

[1] Townend, *Historia* 10 (1961), 380. Sherwin-White (*Letters of Pliny*, 125) distinguishes this administrative *ab epistulis* from the *ab epistulis et ad responsa graeca*.

[2] *PIR*[2] (1966), I 838.

[3] Cf. Syme, *Tacitus*, 92–3; *contra*: Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 124.

[4] 'Episch gerichtet', Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 542; cf. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2. 221: 'épigrammes conçus . . . pour orner ces portraits' (implausible).

[5] Marx, *Philologus* 92 (1937), 83–103.

96

M. Ulpius Traianus (Imperator Caesar Nerva Traianus Augustus)

Editions: Peter 2. clxxvi, 117.

Principal discussions: P. v. Rohden, H. Dessau, *PIR* 3 (1898), V 575; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 434–5, 831; Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres* (1940), 342–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 211; R. Hanslik, 'M. Ulpius (1a) Traianus', *RE* Suppl. 10 (1965), 1035–102; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966); F. A. Lepper, S. Frere, *Trajan's Column* (Gloucester, 1988); Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle* (1990), 122–5; R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 638–40; J. Bennett, *Trajan: Optimus Princeps* (2nd edn., London and New York, 2001); R. Westall, F. Brenk, 'The second and third century', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 363–416, esp. 364–72.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

M. Ulpius Traianus (Trajan), born on 18 September, probably in AD 56,[2] served as military tribune in Syria in the mid-70s under his homonymous father, a successful general from Italica in Baetica, who was raised to the patriciate.[3] Praetor in 84, he was legate of VII Gemina and proved a loyal commander under Domitian, winning the *ordinarius* consulship of 91 and passing to commands on the Rhine or Danube.[4] He was an obvious choice for Nerva when unrest among the praetorian guard made it necessary for him to find a powerful colleague and successor. Trajan was 'adopted' and given *imperium* and tribunician power on about 28 October 97; Nerva died and Trajan was left in sole control on 24 January 98. He developed a good relationship with the acquiescent senate and conducted two successful wars against the Dacians (101–2; 105–7), culminating in the annexation of Dacia. His campaigns against the Parthians, initiated in 113, were only temporarily effective. Trajan died in Cilicia on his way home from the war on ?7 August 117 and was deified.

[1] For dates, see Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*, 122–5.
[2] Dio 68.6.3; later sources suggest dates between 50 and 53: see Bennett, *Trajan* (2001), 238 n. 11.
[3] *PIR* 3 V 574.
[4] The posts Trajan held between 92 and 96 are uncertain: see Bennett, *Trajan* (2001), 44–6.

Work

Trajan was not renowned for intellectual interests,[5] but is quoted as the author of a work entitled *Dacica*. From the one fragment (F1), which is all we know about it, we can deduce that it was in several books (as the quotation specifies book 1), and it is reasonable to assume that it was an account of the Dacian Wars. The fragment describes the march into Dacia in the First Dacian War. Bennett (*Trajan*, 20) thinks of him imitating Caesar's plain style; but it could be argued that Trajan did not imitate Caesar's use of the third person in reference to himself, because in F1 he uses the first person plural, apparently striking a personal note and identifying himself with his army.[6] Strictly speaking, this is not absolutely certain. It is not just that the fragment could be taken from a speech;[7] it would also be theoretically possible to imagine an account in which the Roman forces in general were referred to in the first person plural and the commander in the third person. From Cato onwards it was common in Roman historiography to refer to the Romans as *nostri* ('our men') – see comm. on Cato 5 F20. Perhaps surprisingly, the practice is especially evident in Caesar (e.g. *BG* 2.19: seven times in one chapter!). As Marincola notes, 'so much discussion about "Caesar" in the third person fails to notice that he is surrounded by a sea of "nostri" '.[8] In Caesar, however, it is the imaginary narrator who identifies himself with the Roman forces; the action is described in the third person. There is no suggestion that the narrator took part in the events, and (apart from speeches) first person verbs are used only when he speaks *qua* narrator (e.g. *uti supra demonstrauimus*: *BG* 2.1). There is no parallel in Caesar for the first person action that we find in F1, which therefore suggests that Trajan's was indeed a first person narrative. Perhaps he simply expanded his war reports to the senate.

Another possibility that has been widely canvassed is that the content of the work is reflected in the reliefs of Trajan's Column, which since Cichorius have been interpreted as a narrative series illustrating a written account of the campaigns.[9] This written account must have been published shortly after the conclusion of the Second Dacian War (106) and before the construction of the column (dedicated 113). It is likely enough that Trajan's own account appeared soon after the events themselves, especially if it was meant to represent campaign reports in plain style, like Caesar's *commentarii*. And it stands to reason that the work was published before Trajan left for the East in 113, never to return. It would be surprising if Trajan's own account did not somehow contribute to the narrative scenes represented on the column, but some experts go considerably further than this. Among recent studies, the work of Lepper and Frere, for example, is entirely based on the working assumption that the reliefs are an illustrated version of Trajan's *Dacica*.[10]

[5] Dio 68.7; Aur. Vic. *Caes.* 13.8. See Bennett, *Trajan* (2001), 20.

[6] Interesting observations by Westall and Brenk, in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies*, 371.

[7] Thus Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*, 342; but the chances of this are hardly strong.

[8] Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 212.

[9] C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Traianssäule* 1–2 (Berlin, 1896–1900).

[10] Lepper–Frere, *Trajan's Column* (1988), 26 and *passim*. Their working assumption leads them to a bold and imaginative reconstruction of the *Dacica* (226–9).

The *Dacica* may also have been known as *Commentarii*, and is frequently referred to as such by scholars;[11] but there is no positive evidence for this title. It is true that some late manuscripts of Vegetius add to the title of the *epitoma rei militaris* the information that it is based on the *commentarii* of Cato, Augustus, Trajan, Hadrian, and Frontinus. But this statement, which is variously transmitted only in the *recentiores* (after the 13th cent.), has no good authority[12] and is clearly a garbled version of the passage in 1.8 where Vegetius mentions his use of classic works on military science and of the *constitutiones* of Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian, a very different matter.[13]

We are left to conclude that the only certain evidence for Trajan's work is F1, and that anything that goes beyond the information contained in that short sentence is necessarily speculative. One such speculation that deserves mention is the possibility that Trajan was aided by L. Licinius Sura,[14] a leading general in both Dacian wars, who also allegedly ghosted his speeches.[15]

(BML, TJC)

[11] Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 638–9) suggests *commentarii de bello Dacico*, while Lepper–Frere (*Trajan's Column* (1988), 226–9) imagine a wide-ranging autobiography (*commentarii*) in which *Dacica* was merely the title of the books that dealt with the Dacian Wars.

[12] See the apparatus in the edition of A. Önnerfors (Stuttgart, 1995), 2–3. It is taken seriously, however, by Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres*, 342–3, followed by F. Coarelli, *The Column of Trajan* (Rome, 2000), 13.

[13] Veget. *epit.* 1.8: *haec necessitas compulit eruditis auctoribus ea me in hoc opusculo fidelissime dicere quae Cato ille Censorius de disciplina militari scripsit, quae Cornelius Celsus, quae Frontinus perstringenda duxerunt, quae Paternus diligentissimus iuris militaris adsertor in libros redegit, quae Augusti et Traiani Hadrianique constitutionibus cauta sint.* ('This need [sc. to investigate Roman military discipline] compelled me to reproduce faithfully in this little book, from the authors who have been consulted, what Cato the Censor wrote in his work *On Military Discipline*, what Cornelius Celsus and Frontinus considered worthy of treatment, what Paternus, the most diligent authority on military law, included in his books, and what the ordinances of Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian have advised.')

[14] So Peter 2. clxxvi; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 211; on Sura see *PIR*² I. 253.

[15] Julian, *Caes.* 327a; *H.A.* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 3.11.

97

P. Aelius Hadrianus (Imperator Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus)

Editions: Peter 2. clxxvi–clxxvii, 117–18.

Principal discussions: J. Plew, *Quellenuntersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaiser Hadrian* (Strasbourg, 1890); P. v. Rohden, 'P. Aelius (64) Hadrianus', *RE* 1 (1893), 493–519; Peter, *Gesch. Lit.* 1 (1897), 321, 374–5; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der röm. Litteratur* 3 (6th edn., Leipzig and Berlin, 1913), 50, §§346–52; A. Stein, *PIR*² (1933), A 184; Bardon, *Empereurs et lettres* (1940), 411–13; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 211; R. Syme, 'Hadrian and Italica', *JRS* 54 (1964), 142–9 (=*RP* 2. 617–28); R. Zoepffel, 'Hadrian und Numa', *Chiron* 8 (1978), 391–427, esp. 416–18; R. Syme, 'Hadrian and the senate', *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 31–60 (=*RP* 4. 295–324); Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*² (1990); R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 697–702 (bibl. 697 n. 226); J. Bollansée, '*P. Fay.* 19. Hadrian's memoirs, and imperial epistolary autobiography', *AncSoc* 24 (1994), 279–302; A. R. Birley, *Hadrian, the Restless Emperor* (London and New York, 1997); K. Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 57–65, esp. 59–60; A. R. Birley, 'Hadrian, *de vita sua*', in Reichel (ed.), *Antike Autobiographien* (2005), 223–35; R. Westall, F. Brenk, 'The second and third century', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 363–416, esp. 372–89.

INTRODUCTION

Life[1]

Hadrian, born 24 January 76, in Rome, but of a family originating from Italica, Baetica, and a member of its tribe, Sergia,[2] was first cousin once removed of Trajan[3] and always in the running for the succession. He enjoyed a distinguished career as the governor of military provinces, was suffect consul in 108, and accompanied Trajan on his eastern expedition in 113, becoming legate of Syria. However, Trajan does not seem to have made formal preparations for the succession (Hadrian did not possess *maius imperium* or tribunician power), and Hadrian's accession, dated to 11 August 117, was alleged to be due to deathbed adoption (9 August 117).[4] This, and the execution of four consulars in the sequel (F4), damaged Hadrian's relations with the senate, and it was reluctant to deify him on his death on 10 July 138.[5] The tours of

[1] See *ILS* 308 (AD 112); Stein, *PIR*² A 184; Syme, *JRS* 54 (1964), 142–9; Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*², 128–31; Birley, *Hadrian* (1997); Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 58–9.

[2] For the place, *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 1.3, supported by Syme, *JRS* 54 (1964), 142–9.

[3] *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 1.1.

[4] Ibid. 4.6–7; cf. 4.10.

[5] Ibid. 27.2. See Syme, *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 31–60.

inspection that occupied much of his principate[6] were devoted both to military and administrative matters and to cultural interests.

Works

Hadrian was a renowned intellectual,[7] acquainted with Greek from an early age,[8] *archon* at Athens, founder of the Panhellenion, an orator who dictated his own speeches,[9] poet, and sophist.[10] His literary taste was old-fashioned, preferring Cato to Cicero, Ennius to Virgil, and Coelius Antipater to Sallust.[11] He published his work, Latin verse and Greek epigrams, and at least twelve books of speeches.[12] As to history, as emperor he wrote a Latin autobiography, perhaps but not necessarily in answer to criticisms, since he was looking to establish his reputation, with posterity as well as with his contemporaries,[13] in several volumes (F1). He may also have followed Augustus' example and set up an account of his *res gestae* outside the doors of a prominent building: the Pantheon in Athens.[14] The autobiography was no attempt at self-analysis but rather a conventional vindication of himself.[15] That might be a reason for his apparently allowing it to be published under the name of his freedman Phlegon (T1, also mentioning more than one freedman and claiming that the reason was Hadrian's desire for fame). R. G. Lewis plausibly posits a process of Hellenization by the editor, and goes on to suggest that Phlegon may have used the material as the basis of a life of his own; but both the Latin and the Greek versions were published under his own name.[16] None of the attested fragments can prove the use of the first person.[17] It was cited by *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* (F1–4: from Syme's *Ignotus* or Marius Maximus?[18]) and by Dio (F5–6).

The date of the autobiography is uncertain, but it mentions the death of Antinous in 130; it could belong to the years that followed Hadrian's last journey (134 onwards) or to the end of his life.[19] This view is related to the idea that the opening of a papyrus letter apparently written by Hadrian to Antoninus Pius is in fact the opening of the work, and that it was written in epistolary form (F7; see commentary). If R. G. Lewis is right to attribute to the autobiography a passage of the *HA* concerned with the emperor's powers of divining the future from omens, there may be reason to think that the work was organized on an annalistic basis.[20]

[6] H. Halfmann, *Itinera Principum* (Stuttgart, 1986), 188–210.

[7] *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 14.8, 15.2. See Rohden, *RE* 1. 519.

[8] *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 1.5; 2.1 (Latin: 3.1). [9] Ibid. 20.7. [10] Ibid. 14.5; 15.2; 15.11–13.

[11] Ibid. 16.5 (=Cato 5 T22e, Coelius 15 T11).

[12] Charis. 287. For letters and poems, see Rohden, *RE* 1. 494.

[13] Peter (2. clxxvii and *Gesch. Lit.* 1. 375) notes *cupiditas gloriae*: *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 7.6; 17.8; Dio 69.3.2. Note the *curiositas* of Tert. *apol.* 5. Lewis (*ANRW* 2.34.1, 699) stresses that apologetic aspect.

[14] Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 21 (1893), 623.

[15] Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 67.

[16] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 698. For the implausible claim (T1) that the works of Phlegon were Hadrian's, see Bollansée, *AncSoc* 24 (1994), 195 n. 56, citing Plew, *Quellenuntersuchungen* (1890), 3 and Peter, *Gesch. Lit.* 1. 375 n. 1. See Birley, *Hadrian* (1997), 299 (justly sceptical, though allowing Phlegon's possible influence on the material at 356 n. 38).

[17] Rohden, *RE* 1. 493–4; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2. 211; Birley, *Hadrian* (1997), 299.

[18] See Syme, *Hermes* 96 (1968), 494–502 (= *RP* 2. 650–8).

[19] Birley, *Hadrian* (1997), 299.

[20] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 702, on *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 16.7.

The contents of the autobiography that can be discerned from the surviving fragments seem conventional, and the *Historia Augusta* guilty only of minor slips and misunderstandings: like Augustus, Hadrian gave an account of his ancestry (F1) and earlier career (F2), and his references even to his immediate predecessor were not over-respectful; his position evidently made him an expert on imperial history (F6). Equally conventionally the work included presages, in some form, of Hadrian's own success (F3). When it came to the reign proper, Hadrian, like Tiberius (no. 73), gave an account of the sensational punishment of political enemies that looked well for himself (F4), and the same was true of the other sensational event of the reign, which Hadrian may have included for personal reasons (F5).

(BML)

98

Bruttius

Editions: Peter 2. ccviii–ccviiii, 160.

Principal discussions: H. Gelzer, *Sextus Iulius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* 1 (Leipzig, 1880–98), 287–316; S. Gsell, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien* (Paris, 1894), 287 ff.; A. Henze, 'Bruttius (2)', *RE* 3 (1899), 912; E. T. Merrill, *Essays in Early Christian History* (London, 1924), 164–8; A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die römische Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas* (Stuttgart, 1931), 237–8; A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} B (1933), 159; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 207; R. Syme, 'Praesens the friend of Hadrian', *Studia in honorem I. Kajanto* (Helsinki, 1985), 275–91 (= *RP* 5. 563–78); E. Jeffreys, *Studies in John Malalas* (Sydney, 1990), 174; B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian* (London and New York, 1992), 114–17; K. Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 57–65, esp. 59–60.

INTRODUCTION

Eusebius in his *Chronicle* cited 'Bruttius' as source for a persecution of the Christians by Domitian in which Flavia Domitilla was exiled. Although the *Chronicle* is lost, his account can be recovered from extant translations and statements in later chronicles deriving from the *Chronicle* (F3b–g). As is now generally accepted, the Domitianic persecution is a fiction developed by later Christian writers, and, although Flavia Domitilla was indeed exiled in AD 95, she cannot have been a Christian (see comm. on F3). This would suggest that the 'Bruttius' cited by Eusebius in the *Chronicle* was himself a Christian writer, who either initiated or took over from a predecessor a Christianizing interpretation of Flavia Domitilla's exile. However, a difficulty is constituted by the parallel passage in Eusebius' church history (F3a) which does not mention 'Bruttius', but instead claims the authority of unnamed pagan writers. It is natural to suppose that 'Bruttius' was meant and so that Eusebius held him to be a pagan.

A further issue is whether our two other citations in fact relate to the same author and work. The source for both is the Byzantine chronicler John Malalas, who uses similar forms of the author's name for all three citations (F1 'Bouttios', F2 Böttios, F3e Bõttios). F1 relates to the mythical Danae and F2 to Alexander's conquests. Thus, if all three fragments do belong to the same author, his work must have been a universal chronicle covering the history of the world from very early times to at least the reign of Domitian.

The distinguished senatorial family of Bruttii Praesentes, originating from Lucania, gained consulships in both the second and third centuries AD (*PIR*^{2} B 160–70). However, it is quite uncertain whether our author had any connection with this family, or indeed whether Bruttius is the correct form of his name, on which our sources vary widely. Malalas' variants have already been noticed. 'Bruttios' or similar forms occur in the manuscripts of Jerome (F3b) and in the *Chronicon Paschale* (F1,

F3f). 'Brettios' occurs in the Armenian translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (F3c) and in Syncellus (F3g) and may have the best claim to have been the form used by Eusebius himself. These variations are consistent with 'Bruttius' being the original form of the author's name, but we cannot be sure that this was the case.[1]

Gelzer (*Sextus Iulius Africanus* (1880), 282–3) concluded that Bruttius the historian was a fiction: a second-century Christian writer simply attributed a non-existent historical work to a member of a known Roman aristocratic family in order to claim him as an authority for Flavia Domitilla as a Christian martyr. Gelzer was followed by Peter and by Merrill (*Essays* (1924), 164–8), but such extreme scepticism is difficult to accept. The supposed literary fabrication seems unnecessarily elaborate, and one might wonder why the perpetrator did not choose a more celebrated family for his fictional historian.

Others have supposed that Bruttius was an authentic pagan historian, perhaps a member of the elite Bruttii, who reported the exile of Flavia Domitilla either, like Dio, without referring to Christianity at all, or at most mentioning a charge of Christianity against her without claiming her as a Christian. This is the view held by, for example, Syme (*Studia ... Kajanto* (1985), 275–91), who identifies the historian with C. Bruttius Praesens, consul for the second time in AD 139 (*PIR*^{2} B 164). Syme also identifies this man with Pliny's correspondent (*epist.* 7.3), and so as an Epicurean.[2] Praesens commanded VI Ferrata in Trajan's Parthian War, and was governor of Cilicia when Trajan died there in 117. He may have held his first consulship in 118 or 119 and received his second term from Antoninus Pius, as his colleague, and as *ordinarius*, perhaps in conjunction with the prefecture of the City. If that is correct, he may have lived not more than two years after: his successor as prefect is in office after that.[3]

However, Syme's case for identifying the ordinary consul of 139 with the historian remains just the occurrence of the name, or something close to it, in the sources deriving from Eusebius. No trace remains of a potentially valuable consular historian, who is hardly likely to have been responsible for the nonsense preserved in F3. Moreover, the reign of Domitian, negligently treated by Suetonius, had been covered by Tacitus himself. What could Bruttius add? If he wrote of the events of 95, then, it may have been incidentally, in a memoir. Yet he is called a history writer (and chronographer) by the sources cited in T1.

The conventional descriptions of Bruttius in T1 would be most suitable for the author of a universal history in chronicle form, and the first two fragments suggest that it was indeed just such a work. A universal history would be possible for a pagan author of the second century (cf. e.g. Vibius Maximus, no. 90), perhaps even for an aristocrat such as Bruttius Praesens, but the cultivation of the idea of Domitilla as a Christian (martyr) needs different soil, further from the court than Hadrian's friend. It is altogether more probable that we are dealing with a later Christian author, and a

[1] Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die röm. Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas* (1931), 237–8, draws attention to comparable variations on the names Brundisium and Bruttii.

[2] For him see C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 114–15. Earlier scholars such as Stein regarded them as father and son: *AE* (1950), 66; *IRT* 545.

[3] Syme, *Historia* 9 (1960), 375 (=*RP* 2. 491)

work of Christian chronography, no doubt written in Greek. The first evidence of Domitian as a (tentative) persecutor comes from Melito in 170–80, Hegesippus, and Tertullian (see comm. on F3). Sextus Julius Africanus, a Christian of Antioch (d. *c.*240), wrote a *Chronographia* used by Eusebius for his *Chronicle* and by Syncellus, and in the syncretist atmosphere of Severan Rome he enjoyed the favour of Alexander Severus. The Bruttii would have had freedmen, and one of them may perhaps have filled the bill by being a Christian historian and an emulator of Africanus, possibly belonging to the same period.[4]

There remains the difficulty of Eusebius' claim in the church history that pagan writers reported a Domitianic persecution in which Flavia Domitilla was exiled for confessing Christianity. If the reference is to Bruttius, Eusebius may simply have overlooked his Christianity. Alternatively the reference may be to pagan writers such as Dio who mentioned Flavia Domitilla's exile, and Eusebius will then have glossed over the fact that these writers did not actually represent her as a Christian.

A Christian universal chronicle in Greek would hardly fit our criteria for inclusion in the present collection. However, in view of the uncertainty over the authorship and character of the work, we have retained it rather than relegating it to the Appendix.

(BML, JWR)

[4] It is presumably no more than a coincidence that Commodus' executed wife Bruttia Crispina was a member of the family (*PIR*² B 170), likely to interest any Bruttius in the fate of imperial women.

99

Apuleius

Editions: J. Beaujeu (ed.), *Apulée: opuscules philosophiques et fragments* (Paris, 1973), 174; S. J. Harrison, *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000), 15–16, 24; not in Peter.

Principal discussions: M. Zimmerman, 'Apuleius von Madaura', *DNP* 1 (1996), 910–14; A. Stramaglia, 'Prisciano e l'epitome historiarum di Apuleio', *RFIC* 124 (1996), 192–8; K. Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 292–318, esp. 312; G. N. Sandy, *The Greek World of Apuleius* (Leiden, 1997), esp. 36–8; Harrison, *Apuleius* (see above, editions); S. J. Harrison, *OCD*[4] (2012), 127–8.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Apuleius[1] is a major figure in the history of Latin literature, whose extant works include oratory (*Apologia*, *Florida*), Platonist philosophy (*De deo Socratis*, *De mundo*, *De Platone*), and a novel (*Metamorphoses* or *The Golden Ass*). He was born in the 120s in the Roman colony of Madauros in Africa Proconsularis (modern M'daurouch in Algeria). As he tells us himself (*apol.* 24.9), he came from a prominent and wealthy local family, and at the time of writing (AD 158–9) had embarked on a public career at Madaurus. He received an elite literary education in his native province before going to Athens, where he studied poetry and philosophy (*flor.* 20.4). He also spent time in Rome (*flor.* 17.4), where he may have met his contemporary Aulus Gellius.[2] From the *Florida* (a collection of twenty-three extracts from his speeches) it emerges that he was a noted public speaker in Carthage, and held the chief priesthood of the province of Africa Proconsularis.[3] It is not known when he died; there is no firm evidence for his career or activities after the 160s, which is not to say that he did not live on to old age.

Work

Among Apuleius' lost works attested only by later quotations[4] was a historical *Epitome* (F1–2), which fits in with his boastful remarks in the *Florida* that his literary activity

[1] The *praenomen* L(ucius) is given in some MSS, but there is a strong suspicion that this is a false inference from the name of the first-person narrator in *The Golden Ass*; and without this support Coarelli's bold conjecture, identifying the writer with the L. Apuleius Marcellus attested on a lead pipe from Ostia, becomes even more fragile (F. Coarelli, *DArch* 6 (1988), 27–42; Harrison, *Apuleius*, 1 n. 2 (sceptical)).

[2] Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*[2], 22–6; Sandy, *The Greek World of Apuleius* (1997), 3, prefers to have them meet in Athens in the 150s.

[3] *flor.* 16; Augustine *epist.* 138.19. For the view that this was not the high-priesthood of the imperial cult see J. B. Rives, *AJPh* 115 (1994), 273–90.

[4] Listed by Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 194 n. 3. The fragments are edited by Beaujeu (with translation) and Harrison, who follows Beaujeu's numeration for the fragments, and also cites the testimonia (but without translation).

covered a wide range of genres in poetry and prose, including history (T1), and that in this respect he was more than a match for the greatest philosophers, even if he is for once modest about his level of skill (T2: *maiore uoluntate quam facultate*). Priscian quotes once from an *epitome* in the singular (F1), and once from *epitomae historiarum* in the plural (F2), but it is likely that the same work is being referred to, and that the variation reflects no more than the casual manner of ancient grammarians.[5] Priscian is the source of many of the fragments of Apuleius' lost works, and evidently had a special interest in Apuleius, a fellow North African, whom he appears to quote at first hand.[6] The title *Epitome* does not necessarily suggest the abridgement[7] of the work of a single author such as Livy; the term also came to be applied to historical summaries based on more than one author, as in the case of Florus, possibly an older contemporary of Apuleius.[8] This is one possible interpretation of the plural *epitomae historiarum* in F2.[9]

There is no evidence for the content or scope of the work other than the two fragments, which indicate that it dealt with the Romans (F2) and with the original values of the denarius and its fractions (F1). To some this suggests an antiquarian rather than a historical work,[10] but the evidence is far too slight for that. Equally, perhaps more probably in view of the title, the work could have been a historical summary with digressions of Varronian type.[11] The two preserved fragments deal with the Roman past, but a universal history cannot be ruled out; the possibility that Apuleius covered not just the past of Rome but the histories of other peoples and places may be the implication of the plural *epitomae historiarum*.

(TJC)

[5] Stramaglia, *RFIC* 124 (1996), 193; Harrison, *Apuleius*, 24.
[6] Stramaglia, *RFIC* 124 (1996), 197; Harrison, *Apuleius*, 16 n. 66.
[7] Or, as in the case of Justin's epitome of Trogus, of a collection of excerpts.
[8] R. A. Kaster, *OCD*[4] 529; I. Opelt, *RAC* 5. 944–73; Harrison, *Apuleius*, 24 n. 97.
[9] Thus, tentatively, Harrison, *Apuleius*, 24.
[10] Sallman in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 312.
[11] Harrison, *Apuleius*, 24, and see comm. on F1.

100

L. Septimius Severus (Imperator Caesar L. Septimius Severus Pertinax Aug.)

Editions: Peter 2. clxxviii–clxxviiii, 118–20; F. Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 184–6.

Principal discussions: P. v. Rohden, H. Dessau, *PIR* 3 (1898), S 346; J. Hasebroek, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus* (Heidelberg, 1921); Schanz–Hosius 3[2] (1922), 14–15; Fluss, 'L. Septimius (13) Severus', *RE* 2A (1923), 1940–2002, esp. 2000–1; M. Hammond, 'Septimius Severus, Roman bureaucrat', *HSCPh* 56 (1940), 137–73; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 245–6; T. D. Barnes, 'The family and career of Septimius Severus', *Historia* 16 (1967), 87–107; Z. Rubin, *Civil War, Propaganda and History* (Brussels, 1980); A. R. Birley, *The African Emperor Septimius Severus* (2nd edn., London, 1988; repr. with annotated bibliographical additions, London and New York, 1999); R. G. Lewis, 'Imperial autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 629–706, esp. 706; F. Chausson, 'L'Autobiographie de Septime Sévère', *REL* 73 (1995), 183–98; K. Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 65; D. Kienast, *Röm. Kaisertabelle*[2] (1999), 156–60; R. Westall, F. Brenk, 'The second and third century', in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 363–416, esp. 394–407.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Septimius Severus (11 April 145–4 February 211) came from Lepcis Magna in Tripolitania, of Punic descent on his father's side, Italian on his mother's; kinsmen had already entered the senate.[1] His first wife came from Lepcis, his second, Julia Domna, from a family of Emesa in Syria that claimed princely descent. Severus, quaestor 170–2, reached the suffect consulship in 190 and as governor of Pannonia Superior 191–3 was well placed to claim the purple on 9 April 193 when Pertinax was assassinated.[2] His eastern rival Pescennius Niger was defeated in 194 and his partisans punished (cf. T4); a campaign against the Parthians followed. In 195 Severus announced his 'adoption' by M. Aurelius.[3] The western 'Caesar' Clodius Albinus was eliminated at Lugdunum in 197, a brutal vengeance ensuing (cf. T4). The second half of 197 was devoted to a renewed Parthian war, and a family tour of Egypt followed, involving religious and cultural events as well as administration.[4] In 202 Severus returned to Rome with Domna and their two sons Bassianus ('Caracalla') and Geta; they then visited Lepcis and other African towns. In 208 war in Britain was in

[1] Tripolitanian background: Birley, *African Emperor* (1988), 1–36. Birth date: Dio 76(77).17.4. Two relatives, probably first cousins of Severus' father, had held suffect consulships in 153 and 160: *HA Sev.* 1.2 has great-uncles (*patrui magni*).

[2] Career and accession: Birley, *African Emperor* (1988), 37–107.

[3] 'Adoption': ibid. 117.

[4] Egyptian tour: ibid. 138–9

preparation, and after campaigning in Scotland (in spite of being a martyr to gout) and winning the title Britannicus, Severus died at Eboracum.[5]

Work

An equestrian forbear was complimented by Statius on his Italian credentials as 'one of the most cultivated members of the second order in the state'.[6] In 163 or 164 Severus ended his education at Lepcis by delivering a formal public speech; by the standards of his city Severus was sufficiently accomplished, and he went to Rome to continue his studies, and later, after a reverse in his career, to Athens.[7] Sallmann plausibly maintains that his intellectual interests were particularly in the law.[8]

However, Severus' education and speech were not always treated with respect in antiquity. Like Vespasian and Hadrian, he was accused of having an accent (regional rather than foreign) into old age,[9] and is said even in his own view to have received only mediocre training, in spite of his youthful prominence at Lepcis;[10] his sister, visiting him in the East, had to be sent away, it was claimed, because her Latin was inadequate; in the charitable view, as the wife of a Greek speaker, in a Greek-speaking environment, she had forgotten her Latin.[11] Cultural judgements are necessarily subjective and allowance has to be made for elite contempt for a usurping 'new man', as in the case of Vespasian. It would be good to be able to privilege the observations of Dio, who knew the man, over the later contributions of the *Historia Augusta*, Sex. Aurelius Victor, and the anonymous biographer, although some may derive from another contemporary, Marius Maximus, but we have to remember the conflicting layers in Dio's work, which he began at Severus' instigation[12] and ended two decades after his death. On the favourable side it is conceded that Severus, who is ascribed a clarion voice, is said to have spoken particularly fluent Punic; he was also a good scholar in both Latin and Greek; when he was emperor he devoted his afternoon walks to conversation in both languages; he is even credited with an interest not only in oratory but also in philosophy (T1, T4). In fact he is said to have spoken of literary studies as well as military as leading to his success.[13] But Dio's remark that the intellectually keen and vigorous Severus himself would have wished to have a better education undermines the praise. If reporting faithfully, Dio was latching on to something that Severus might have wished later never to have said, or that he calculated would make him seem modest.

[5] Reign: ibid. 108–87.

[6] Italianized forebear: Stat. *Silv.* 4 *pr.*; 4.5.33–40.

[7] Public speech and departure for Rome: *HA* | Spart. | *Sev.* 1.4–5. Athens: 3.7, with Birley, *African Emperor* (1988), 73.

[8] Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 65, citing *HA* | Spart. | *Sev.* 1.4.

[9] Accent: *HA* | Spart. | *Sev.* 19.9; see Birley, *African Emperor* (1988), 35 (provincial, not foreign), and 42; J. N. Adams, *The Regional Diversification of Latin, 200 BC–AD 600* (Cambridge, 2007), 260. Sabine vowels: Suet. *Vesp.* 22; Hadrian: *HA* | Spart. | *Hadr.* 3.1.

[10] Severus' deficient education: Dio 76(77).16.1.

[11] Severus' sister: *HA* | Spart. | *Sev.* 15; Latin forgotten: Birley, *African Emperor* (1988), 131–2, 213–14. Sceptical: Hasebroek, *Untersuchungen* (1921), 116.

[12] Dio's early work: Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 193. Layered: Rubin, *Civil War Propaganda* (1980), 41–2.

[13] Severus' voice: *HA* | Spart. | *Sev.* 19.9. Punic: *Epit. de Caes.* 20.8; conversations in Latin and Greek: Dio 76(77).17.2; *HA* | Spart. | *Sev.* 1.4; literature and success: 18.11; Severus' wish: Dio 76(77).16.1.

In spite of Severus' particular reputation for superstition, his preoccupation with omens and dreams was shared by most Romans living in an age of anxiety and notably by Dio, whose opening work on the presages of his rule was presented to him.[14] Severus' autobiography echoed Hadrian's interest in omens (F1, with comm.; cf. Hadrian 97 F3). It gave an account of those that had come to him as signs of his future greatness. Both men were believers and exploiters of the material, though anyone might be assiduous in informing himself about his future under an unpredictable monarch. As legionary legate in 180 he visited the authoritative oracle of Zeus Belus, 'Ruler of Destiny', at Apameia, and received a flattering description of Agamemnon. On a later visit, probably in 201–2, he was warned of a bloody end to his dynasty—so we are told, hardly by Severus himself; that would be a late embellishment of Dio's, composed at the end of his work.[15] Severus, so the *Historia Augusta* alleges, had to face trial on a charge of consulting seers or astrologers, not about his own destiny but about the imperial position. That was in 190, on his return to Rome from Sicily; but he was acquitted.[16]

Citations from the autobiography come in Greek as well as Latin, and it is theoretically possible that it was written in Greek. Bardon unequivocally states this as the case, but without offering any arguments for it, while Peter remained uncommitted. It seems more likely that Severus, aiming after the civil wars of 193–7 first to justify himself in Rome and Italy, wrote, as Vespasian had, in Latin; a Greek version destined for consumption in the East may have followed. The title *De uita sua* (F2, F4, and see esp. T2, T3, and F1) makes it clear that there was more in the work than military commentaries, and that it included an account of his private life; its closest predecessor would have been Hadrian's work rather than Vespasian's or Trajan's, with Sulla's as a remoter ancestor; self-analysis was not to be expected. Lewis damns it on the strength of the plethora of superstitious material that has come down to us as 'poor stuff': it was little more than muffled echoes of past exponents, with claims to power based on omens (and therefore fate) and crude denigrations of rivals allegedly considered as possible successors.[17] The date of composition cannot be fixed, beyond being later than the defeat of Albinus (T1), but Chausson convincingly rebuts Rubin's case for putting it soon after 205 as a justification for the execution of Plautianus,[18] mainly because there is no surviving mention of any event later than Albinus' death; the argument that Severus had no time to write during and after the civil wars is hardly to be taken seriously (Chausson cites the examples of M. Aurelius and Julian). Chausson's view of the autobiography as an apology written in the wake of the destruction of Niger and Albinus is convincing. Noting though that Severus justified

[14] Response to Dio's treatise: Dio 72(73).23.1–2.

[15] Oracle of Bel consulted: Dio 78(79).8.5–6; first it quoted Hom. *Il.* 2.478–9, a flattering description of Agamemnon, later Euripides *Phoen.* 20. Dating of visits: J. Balty, *AC* 50 (1981), 5–14; '*Fortunae rector*' (*CIL* 12.1277).

[16] Charge of consulting seers: *HA* |Spart.| *Sev.* 4.3.

[17] The reference to the 'autobiography' in the Loeb translation of *HA* |Capit.| *Clod. Alb.* 12.14 (and apparently accepted by Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 187–8, though he does entertain the alternative idea) is a mistranslation of *in uita eius*—actually a reference to the *HA*'s life of Severus. This view is strongly supported, though not proved, by the documentation in *HA* |Spart.| *Sev.* 13–15.1, including the listing of named victims.

[18] Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 188–9, cf. Rubin, *Civil War Propaganda* (1980), 134–5.

his cruelty (T4), he sees it as a slogan, suggested also by Severus' comparison of himself in a speech with Sulla, Marius, and Augustus. Rather he excused it as a necessity for survival (ἀσφαλεστέραν) and denied certain instances.[19]

The structure of the work was chronological.[20] It probably began with an account of Severus' family and early life (cf. T3), then went on to the omens, although they could equally have appeared at the beginning or end of the work; then came the account of the struggle with Severus' rivals.

The work was read, and used as a source by flatterers (it was described as 'candid', T2, T4), but after the author's death with a critical eye.[21] Chausson regards Marius Maximus as the first author to use it and as the source of the entire later tradition for 193–211, so that it was known second or third hand.[22] Dio offers the story of Albinus' death in February 197, not as Severus wrote it, but 'as it was' (T1: Severus presumably wrote of a degrading death, as in *HA Sev.* 11.6 and *Clod. Alb.* 9.3–4, not of efficient suicide).[23] It was noted that Severus had nothing to say of his first wife Paccia Marciana, mentioning only Domna (T3), Peter thinks (2. clxxviii) for the two sons she bore him, but it may be that Marciana's comparative lack of social prestige kept her out. Chausson, on the other hand, maintains[24] that Paccia did not merit mention, and draws attention to the assertion that Severus put up statues to her. This would be a part of the honours he paid to all his family (*HA* [Spart.] *Sev.* 14. 5). Chausson catalogues the epigraphic record of such statues and notes their comparatively early date (before 205); this is further support for his early dating of the apologetic autobiography.

(BML)

[19] Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 196. Comparison with Sulla, etc., Dio 75(76). 8.1.

[20] Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 188.

[21] Flatterers: Peter 2. clxxviii, citing Her. 2.15.6; 3.7.3.

[22] Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 183. He traces the connections between individual passages and includes *HA* [Capit.] *Clod. Alb.* 3.4, in which Marius Maximus also says (*etiam Marius Maximus dicit*) that Severus planned to make Niger and Albinus his heirs, and 12.13–14, on Maximus' and Herodian's account of his acts of vengeance, amongst his testimonia for the autobiography. The verbs *dicit*, *loquitur* in F4, cf. F2, F5, and F6, are characteristic of citation from the autobiography—but (193) not the *negabat* of *Sev.* 15.6 (responsibility for the death of the general Laetus in 198 or 199; cf Dio 75(76). 10.3).

[23] Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 706; Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 188.

[24] Chausson, *REL* 73 (1995), 190–2.

101

L.(?) Marius Maximus

Editions: G. Tropea, *Studi sugli Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 3. *Mario Massimo: vita e frammenti* (Messina, 1899); Peter 2. clxxx–clxxxviii, 121–9; A. R. Birley, 'Marius Maximus the consular biographer', *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997), 2684–93 (these works are referred to in what follows by editor's name only).

Principal discussions: J. J. Müller, 'Der Geschichtsschreiber Marius Maximus', in M. Büdinger (ed.), *Untersuchungen zur römischen Kaisergeschichte* 3 (Leipzig, 1870), 17–202; J. Plew, *Marius Maximus als direkte und indirekte Quelle der Script. Hist. Aug.* (Strasbourg, 1878); C. Lécrivain, *Études sur l'Histoire Auguste* (Paris, 1904); K. Hönn, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Viten des Heliogabalus und des Severus Alexander im Corpus der Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1911); F. Miltner, 'L. Marius (48) Maximus', *RE* 14 (1930), 1828–31; E. Hohl, 'Bericht über die Literatur zu den Scriptores Historiae Augustae für die Jahre 1924–1935', *JAW* 256 (1937), 127–56; E. Hohl, 'Das Ende Caracallas, eine kritische Studie', *Misc. Acad. Berol.* 2.1 (1950), 276–93; G. Barbieri, 'Mario Massimo', *RFIC* 32 (1954), 36–66, 262–75 (=*Scritti minori* (Rome, 1988), 49–93); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 170–2; E. Hohl, 'Kaiser Pertinax und und die Thronbesteigung seines Nachfolgers im Lichte der Herodiankritik', *SDAW* 2 (1956); Syme, *Ammianus and the HA* (1968), 89–93; R. Syme, 'Not Marius Maximus', *Hermes* 96 (1968), 494–502 (=*RP* 2 (1979), 650–8); T. D. Barnes, 'The lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin historical tradition', *BHAC* 1968/9 (Bonn, 1970), 13–44; Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (1971), 113–45; A. R. Birley, *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor* (London, 1971), 308–26 (this section, on Marius Maximus, is not included in the second edition (London, 1988) or its updated reprint (London, 1999)); R. Syme, 'Marius Maximus once again', *BHAC* 1970 (Bonn, 1972), 287- 302 (=*Historia Augusta Papers* (Oxford, 1983), 30–45); H.-G. Pflaum, 'La Valeur de l'information historique de la Vita Commodi à la lumière des personages nommément cités par le biographe', *BHAC* 1970 (Bonn, 1972), 226–9; S. D'Elia, 'Note su Mario Massimo', *StudUrb(B)* 49.1 (1975), 459–81; T. D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978); Z. Rubin, *Civil War Propaganda and Historiography* (Brussels, 1980), 133–93; R. P. H. Green, 'Marius Maximus and Ausonius' Caesares', *CQ* 31 (1981), 226–31; L. Petersen, *PIR*^{2} M (1983), 308; A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des IIe et IIIe siècles* (Paris, 1994), lii–lix; A. R. Birley, 'Marius Maximus the consular biographer', *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997), 2678–757; K. Sallmann in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 53–6; A. Molinier, 'Marius Maximus source latine de la vie de Commode?' *HAC* 6 (1998), 223–48; F. Paschoud, 'Propos sceptiques et iconoclastes sur Marius Maximus', *HAC* 7 (1998), 241–54; H. W. Bird, 'Mocking Marius Maximus', *Latomus* 58 (1999), 850–60; C. Bertrand Dagenbach, 'Aux sources de "l'histoire auguste" à travers des fragments de Marius Maximus et de Dexippe', *Ktema* 29 (2004), 223–30; J. Fündling, *Kommentar zur Historia Augusta* 4. *Vita Hadriani* 1 (Bonn, 2006), 102–18; M. Kulikowski, 'Marius Maximus in Ammianus and the *Historia Augusta*', *CQ* 57 (2007), 244–56.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Marius Maximus the author is generally thought to be identical with the senator L. Marius L. f. Quir. Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, whose career and family are well attested in documents registered and discussed in *PIR*^{2} and elsewhere.[1] Marius' antecedents (stemma in *PIR*^{2}) were African, as the tribe suggests, his father (*PIR*^{2} M 313, perhaps adoptive) rising to an equestrian procuratorship (*ILS* 1389), the grandfather a *scriba quaestorius* at Thugga (*ILA* 592), perhaps their native city (Birley, 2696, suggests Carthage). Marius was a senator and general, born *c.*160 and so a younger contemporary of Septimius Severus, and began his career in about 178. He was well travelled and proved a survivor in the political crises of the Severan age. Marius saw his first military service as tribune at Moguntiacum and Castra Regina, but was at Rome, where inscriptions suggest that he had a house on the Caelian, as urban quaestor under Commodus. Promoted to praetorian rank *c.*187, he was put in charge of Legio I Italica at Novae, and fought for Severus against Pescennius Niger in the siege of Byzantium, 193–6, and against Clodius Albinus at the battle of Lugdunum in 197. After or while governing Belgica he was suffect consul in 198 or 199. The governorship of Lower Germany followed between 199 and 204, and then that of Coele Syria, where he was in 208 (*PDura* 56ABC; 57; 60 AD). Uniquely, to our knowledge, he was proconsul both of Asia (for two years, one while Caracalla was in Anatolia: *IGRR* 4. 1287) and of Africa, probably in that order, from 214 to 217.[2] Macrinus appointed him prefect of the city in 217, a position he may have held until 219 (Dio 78.14.1–4, 36.1–5; 79.2.1–3). He had no post from Elagabalus but was consul for the second time in 223 (*ordinarius*). His son and nephew also reached *ordinarius* consulships, in 232 and 237 respectively (*PIR*^{2} M 307; 312; Birley 2703).

As stated above, this distinguished man is usually taken to have been the author now under consideration. We have provisionally accepted this identification as probable, although it needs to be said that it is not supported by any direct evidence and is actually far from secure.[3] An obvious alternative would be his son, the consul *ordinarius* of 232. Between him and his father there is little to choose, unless we take T2 to be saying that Marius Maximus himself wrote salacious verses about Commodus' unfortunate condition, and was pleased to include them in his life of Commodus. This is how it is understood by Birley, 2683–4, who infers that the author

[1] Birley 2697–708; cf. Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 141, and Pflaum, *BHAC* (1970), 226–31. For the full nomenclature see *ILS* 2935–6.

[2] P. M. M. Leunissen, *Konsulen und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.)* (Amsterdam, 1989), 217. The later dates proposed by B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der Provinzen röm. Nord Afrikas von Aug. bis Diocletianus* (Lund, 1960), 115–16, have not been accepted: E. Birley, *JRS* 52 (1962), 224; Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (1971) 137; Pflaum, *BHAC* (1970), 228–9.

[3] The identification was questioned by nineteenth-century scholars, including Müller in Büdinger (ed.) *Untersuchungen* 3 (1870), 32, 170; Plew, *Marius Maximus* (1878), 10; Lécrivain, *Études sur l'HA* (1904), 193–4; but recent scholars have avoided the problem, and have taken the identification for granted.

was already an adult by the start of the 190s—which would rule out the consul of 232. On the other hand, T2 could mean that Marius Maximus took pride in quoting in his life of Commodus the scurrilous verses that had circulated at the time (but without any implication that he had composed them himself),[4] just as he is said to have repeated some of Elagabalus' jokes (T7).[5]

There is also the possibility that the author was an otherwise unknown person with the same name as the two consulars, something that is not to be dismissed out of hand, given that the name Marius and the *cognomen* Maximus are both extremely common.[6] Lécrivain (l.c., n. 3) found it hard to believe that the gossip-mongering biographer revealed by the fragments could have been a distinguished *homme d'état*. Others have pointed to passages in the *HA* that could not have been written by the great consular, for example the statement in [Spart.] *Seu.* 9.11 that Pescennius Niger died *apud Cyzicum*: the consular Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, who held a major command in the war against Niger, would have known that Niger died fleeing from Antioch. This is generally taken to indicate that Marius Maximus was not the main source of the *HA* at this point;[7] but one might equally well conclude from the same evidence that Marius Maximus the biographer was not the man of that name who commanded in the war.

The fact is that the references to Marius Maximus the writer give no information whatever about him as a person, while the evidence for Marius Maximus the consular (and his son) contains no hint of any literary activity. The two bodies of data are completely independent of one another, and the safe course would seem to be to keep them separate. In other words, discussion of the biographer and his work should be based only on the surviving testimonia and fragments; and even though there may be a better than even chance that the biographer is identical with the great consular, it would not be wise to make inferences about his work from what 'Marius the consular' might have known, thought, or written.[8]

[4] We have tried to preserve the ambiguity in our translation. Other translators seem to favour the idea that Marius Maximus merely quoted the verses, thus: 'Many verses were written alluding to this deformity; and Marius Maximus prides himself on preserving these in his biography of Commodus' (Magie). 'Many verses were written on this subject, and Marius Maximus prides himself on recording them in his work' (Birley). 'On écrivait à ce propos beaucoup de vers que Marius Maximus est tout fier de citer aussi dans son ouvrage' (Chastagnol).

[5] But note that this text is not above suspicion. See further below.

[6] Thus Birley 2684 and n. 19.

[7] Barnes, *BHAC* (1968–9), 40; id., *Sources of the HA* (1978), 106; Rubin, *Civil War Propaganda* (1980), 63–4. For Kulikowski (*CQ* 57 (2007), 245 n. 3) this argument is 'unanswerable'. Birley (2713), who does regard Marius Maximus as the main source of the *HA*, argues for a textual corruption: Marius would have written *apud Ciliciam*, which was already corrupted to *apud Cyzicum* when his text was used by the *HA*.

[8] Syme's oft-repeated description of Marius Maximus as 'the consular biographer' (references in Birley 2679 n. 1), which has now become common currency, we find unhelpful and potentially misleading. Likewise Birley (2721–3) trawls the *HA* for items that the consular Marius Maximus would have been 'especially well qualified to supply', and uses this as an indirect means to find material to supplement the attested fragments, while others are inclined to interpret the surviving fragments in the light of the known or supposed political leanings or attachments of a leading senator and consular of the Severan age (thus e.g. Rubin, *Civil War Propaganda* (1980), esp. 145–93).

Work

The many citations in the *HA* make it clear that Marius Maximus was the author of biographies of emperors at least from Trajan to the Severi. It seems, moreover, that his biographies, like those of Suetonius, were organized by theme and included scandalous and trivial material (T2, T7, F8, F13, F15), as well as digressions, orations,[9] and documents, including letters (T4) and official records (F16).[10] On the other hand, there are contrasts with Suetonius, most obviously Marius' notorious prolixity (T10); and it is not certain either that he described the physical characteristics of his subjects.[11]

There is much dispute concerning the scope of his work, its date of composition, its importance as a source of the *HA*, and its quality. As to scope, the *HA* refers explicitly to lives of Trajan (T9), Hadrian (F8a–b), Marcus (T1/ F13, F11, F12a), Pertinax (T4), Severus (T5, F17), and Elagabalus (T7). The life of Marcus occupied two books (T1/F13, F12a), and that of Severus possibly three (T6).[12] From other quotations and references we may reasonably infer that he wrote lives of Antoninus Pius (F9) and Commodus (T2, F15, F16). This suggests a continuous series of imperial biographies covering the second and early third centuries. The starting point is a matter of conjecture. It is possible that he went back to the Flavians, or even to Augustus, as W. Hartke suggested;[13] but this is rendered unlikely by T11, which would surely have been worded differently if Marius had written lives of the emperors treated by Suetonius.[14] The testimonium comes close to implying something that is likely enough in any case, namely that Marius continued Suetonius' *Vitae Caesarum*, a recognized masterpiece that clamoured for emulation rather than repetition. On this basis it is reasonable to conjecture that Marius Maximus began with Nerva, and to assign F1 to a life of that emperor, rather than to a life of Domitian, as an unprejudiced reading might otherwise have suggested (see comm. ad loc.).

The idea that Marius Maximus set out to continue Suetonius may be accepted as a working hypothesis, but it is important to stress that it is no more than that; and the

[9] The orations (T3, F14) are referred to by the author of the *HA* as if they were genuine speeches quoted verbatim by Marius Maximus, rather than freely composed by him in the traditional manner of ancient historians. Certainly the evidence seems to show that Marius went beyond Suetonius in citing documents not only verbatim but in full; and Marius himself was evidently concerned to show that the speeches of Antoninus Pius (possibly quoted by him) were the emperor's own compositions (F9).

[10] On the authenticity of F16, see comm. ad loc. Whether the letters were genuine we cannot say, although Bardon (*Litt. inconnue*, 2. 271) regards them as suspect.

[11] For comparison with Suetonius see Peter 2. clxxxii–clxxxiii and Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2. 270.

[12] T5 speaks of the 'first *septenarius*' of Marius' life of Severus. It is not at all clear what *septenarius* means (we have followed Magie and translated it as 'section'). Literally it means 'consisting of seven parts'. Thus Barbieri (*RFIC* 82 (1954), 272–5) deduced that the life of Severus was divided into books, each of which was a *(liber) septenarius*, i.e. a book in seven parts or chapters, perhaps playing on the emperor's name *Septimius*, and his known obsession with the number seven. However that may be, Barbieri argued further that *primo* must imply the first of more than two *septenarii*—otherwise *priore* would have been required (Barbieri l.c.; Birley 2741). Hence (at least) three books—but probably no more than three.

[13] W. Hartke, *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones* (Diss. Berlin, 1932), 20; cf. Hohl, *JAW* 256 (1937), 144. As we rely almost exclusively on citations in the *HA*, the absence of fragments dealing with earlier emperors is hardly a decisive consideration. On F1 see below, and comm. ad loc.

[14] Thus, rightly, Barbieri, *RFIC* 82 (1954), 42–3.

further assumption, widely made by scholars, that he too wrote the lives of twelve emperors is even more fragile. The argument is based on Ausonius' *Caesares*, in which a series of verse quatrains on the twelve Caesars of Suetonius are followed by twelve more, from Nerva to Elagabalus. Although Marius Maximus is not explicitly acknowledged in the way that Suetonius is,[15] he has been widely canvassed as Ausonius' source for the second twelve on the basis of alleged similarities between his verses and corresponding passages in the *HA* that are thought to derive from Marius Maximus.[16] On this reasoning Marius Maximus' work is believed to have contained the lives of twelve emperors, as follows: Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Pertinax, Didius Julianus, Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Macrinus, Elagabalus.

Unfortunately, this construction is founded on sand. Green has demonstrated that similarities between Ausonius and Marius Maximus are weak and unconvincing, and that there is no justification for using the one as a mirror of the other.[17] It has also been pointed out that although the surviving MSS break off after the first couplet on Elagabalus, there is no reason to suppose that Ausonius ended with him; indeed he probably went on to deal with succeeding emperors.[18] If Ausonius is excluded we are left with no way of knowing either the number or the identity of the emperors treated by Marius Maximus, other than those directly attested by the fragments and testimonia.

The terminal point is also shrouded in uncertainty. Although there are several citations of Marius Maximus in the *HA*'s life of Alexander Severus (T8, T9, F2, F8b, F17), all of them refer to earlier emperors, and there is no evidence to suggest that he wrote a life of Alexander Severus or any of his successors. The latest reference is to a life of Elagabalus (T7), but this text is suspicious both because of its isolation in a life that otherwise shows no trace of Marius, and because of its content (we are asked to believe that Marius reproduced some of the jokes that Elagabalus had composed, in Greek, for slaves to use against their masters at the time of the vintage-festival: this looks like a characteristic piece of *HA* fiction).[19] There is also a question mark over the *HA*'s life of Macrinus, which contains very little factual material and marks a sharp contrast with the earlier 'main' lives; it is at this point that the character of the *HA* changes, and the lives of the main emperors come to resemble the earlier 'secondary' lives.[20]

[15] Noted as a decisive objection to the theory by I. Cazzaniga, *PdP* 27 (1972), 150.

[16] The case was made by T. D. Barnes, *JRS* 57 (1967), 66 n. 11, and independently by F. Della Corte, *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 483–91 (with earlier bibliography); see further Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 57, 83, 92, 94, and elsewhere (e.g. *RP* 2. 652); Barnes, *Sources of the HA* (1978), 103.

[17] Green, *CQ* 31 (1981), 226–36; id., *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford, 1991), 557–9; the point had already been forcefully made by J. Schwartz, *BHAC* 1970, 266–9.

[18] J. Schwartz, *BHAC* 1970, 266–7; Birley 2713–14, with further bibliography. In general cf. D'Elia, *StudUrb(B)* 49 (1975), 463 n. 12.

[19] The authenticity of the citation is questioned by Hönn, *Quellenuntersuchungen* (1911), 46–7; J. Schwartz, *BHAC* (1970), 261; Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (1994), xli, lvii.

[20] The distinction goes back to Mommsen (*Hermes* 25 (1890), 246–52=*Ges. Schr.* 7. 316–25), who identified a series of 'primary' biographies, of emperors from Hadrian to Caracalla, and another group of (historically greatly inferior) 'secondary' lives of princes and pretenders (e.g. Aelius Caesar, Avidius Cassius, Pescennius Niger, Clodius Albinus). The latter were a novel feature introduced by the *HA*; we know from T11 that Marius Maximus had not written separate lives of princes and pretenders. See further General Introduction, I. 77–8.

The *uita Macrini* is mostly trivial fiction; moreover it begins with a preface in which the author, 'Julius Capitolinus', notes the absence of good sources, and invokes the dubious figure of Junius Cordus (*Macr.* 1.3), allegedly a trivializing biographer who appears frequently in the lives attributed to 'Capitolinus' and is generally regarded as bogus.[21] This state of affairs would be hard to explain if a life of Macrinus by Marius Maximus were available,[22] and it creates serious difficulties for those who have inferred from Ausonius' *Caesares* that he must have written one. Their explanation is that Marius Maximus was only a minor source for the *HA*, and was wilfully ignored by the author of the *uita Macrini*. Indeed this is one of Syme's principal arguments for the existence of an unknown biographer, 'Ignotus', who would have been the main source of the *HA* from Hadrian to Caracalla, but no longer available for subsequent emperors (on 'Ignotus' see below). But this argument is double-edged: one might rather suppose that in the absence of the main source the author of the *uita Macrini* would have relied, *faute de mieux*, on Marius Maximus if he had been available.[23] Things are even worse for those who regard Marius Maximus as the main source of the *HA*: Birley's suggestion, that out of shame or embarrassment Marius treated his former benefactor Macrinus 'with deliberately contemptuous brevity', is hardly satisfactory.[24] It is surely altogether more probable that Marius Maximus did not, after all, write a life of Macrinus—either because he regarded him as a usurper, or because his work came to an end with Caracalla.[25]

The scope of the work gives a general indication of the time of writing. It must have been completed after 217 (if it ended with Caracalla), or after 222 (if it included the reign of Elagabalus); that does not, of course, rule out the possibility that he started writing earlier.[26] On the other hand, the end of the work provides only a *terminus post quem* for the date of composition, and there is no reason in principle why Marius Maximus, like Suetonius, should not have written twenty or thirty years (or more) after the latest events recorded in his work.[27] On any view he could have known,

[21] Syme, *HA Papers* (1983), 103–5, and see I. Appendix 2. It is certainly a curious feature that 'Cordus' is cited only by 'Capitolinus' (cf. Momigliano, *Quinto contributo*, 103); other invented sources in the *HA* are also exclusive to their respective '*scriptores*' (e.g. Onesimus, cited six times by 'Vopiscus', but not by anyone else), whereas genuine sources (Dexippus, Herodian, Phlegon, Asinius Quadratus, and Marius Maximus) are cited by several of them. The data are usefully tabulated by Tropea 12.

[22] Especially if the biographer is identified with the consular Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, who was appointed prefect of the city by Macrinus, and received dispatches from him (Dio 78.36.1; 79.2.1; cf. Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 57–8).

[23] Thus, rightly, Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 264.

[24] Birley 2713, reprising his earlier discussion in *Septimius Severus* (1971), 321–2. The argument is inverted by Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (1994), lvi–lvii, who suggests that the author of the *HA* failed to use Marius Maximus' life of Macrinus because it was too long!

[25] That Maximus did not write a *Macrinus* is 'the obvious, almost inescapable conclusion', according to Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 264, citing Müller in Büdinger (ed.), *Untersuchungen* 3 (1870), 98–9, who thought that Macrinus was excluded as a usurper who never ruled at Rome; similarly Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 270. Others (see n. 19) argue that the passage attributing a life of Elagabalus to Maximus (T 7) is bogus, and that his series of lives ended with Caracalla.

[26] Writing under Severus Alexander: Birley 2683, but noting the possibility that he could have written the lives in retirement under Elagabalus (cf. also 2700, and Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 142). Sallmann (in Herzog–Schmidt 4. 54) offers the beginning of the third century as a possible starting date.

[27] This remains true whatever view is taken of the identity of the author. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus (cos. ord. 223) would have reached the age of 80 around 240, and could have taken up the pen in old age; an even later date is possible for his son (cos. 232) or an otherwise unknown man of the same name.

and made use of, Cassius Dio's work, but we cannot be sure whether he wrote before or after Asinius Quadratus (see introduction to Quadratus (no. 102), below) or Herodian.[28]

Citations explicitly ascribed to Marius in the *HA* are mostly accepted as genuine (but there are exceptions: on T7 see above, and n. 19, and notice Syme's view of F2, on which see comm. ad loc.). Deeper disagreements lie in his status as a source and so how far his work can be detected when he is not named. The most important evidence is the change in the nature of the *HA* itself. The superior quality of the 'main' lives from Hadrian to Caracalla is best accounted for on the theory that they are based on a well-informed source containing much good historical information including detailed facts and dates. So far as is known the one identifiable candidate—the only possible source to be regularly acknowledged by name in the relevant portions of the *HA*—is Marius Maximus, who for centuries has been assumed to be the prime source in question.[29] The case was made in detail by Müller in 1870 and has been widely accepted ever since.[30]

The only alternative is to presume an otherwise unknown writer whom the author of the *HA* followed without acknowledgement. This idea has frequently been invoked since the start of the twentieth century, the unknown writer being imagined either as an annalistic historian like Tacitus,[31] or, more commonly in recent times, as a biographer contemporary with Marius Maximus and like him continuing Suetonius.[32] The case for 'Ignotus' (as Syme called him) is based on a series of negative arguments allegedly showing that Marius Maximus was *not* the main source of the *HA*. These arguments, however, are mostly circular[33] and have been systematically rebutted by

[28] The composition of Dio's work can now be dated in the period 220–31 (Barnes, *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 240–55). Marius Maximus' knowledge of Dio: Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, 103. On the other hand, Molinier (*HAC* 6 (1998), 241) argues that Dio used Marius Maximus. Herodian is generally thought to have written *c.*250, but with considerable latitude either way (C. R. Whittaker, *Herodian* 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), ix–xix; G. Alföldy, *AncSoc* 2 (1971), 204–9).

[29] First advanced by Casaubon in 1603 (cited by Barnes, *Sources of the HA* (1978), 99 n. 10).

[30] Müller in Büdinger (ed.), *Untersuchungen* 3 (1870), 19–22; Plew, *Marius Maximus* (1878); Peter, *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Leipzig, 1892), 108; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 238; Hohl, *Klio* 27 (1934), 156; *Miscellanea Acad. Berolinensia* 2.1 (1950), 276–93; *SDAW* Abh. 2 (1956); W. Seston, *Mélanges Carcopino* (Paris, 1966), 880–8; A. D. E. Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 262–7; Birley, *Septimius Severus* (1971), 308–26; J. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus* (Munich, 1974), 124–33; Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (1994), lvii; Birley, 2708–14; Molinier *HAC* 6 (1998), 223–48.

[31] A. von Domaszewski, *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 10 (1900), 233; E. Kornemann, *Kaiser Hadrian und der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom* (Leipzig, 1905); O. T. Schulz, *Das Kaiserhaus der Antonine und der letzte Historiker Roms* (Leipzig, 1907). For the history of this theory see Barnes, *Sources of the HA* (1978), 99, and Birley 2708–10, with further references. It was demolished by W. Weber, *GGA* 170 (1908), 945–1008, and Barbieri, *ASNP* ser. 2.3 (1934), 525–38.

[32] L'écrivain, *Études sur l'HA* (1904), 191–2; Barbieri, *RFIC* 32 (1954), 43, 62, and 262–70; Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, 92–3; *Emperors and Biography*, 30–53, 113–34; *HA Papers* (1983), 30–45; *RP* 2. 650–8; Barnes, *JRS* 57 (1967), 66; *BHAC* (1968–9), 13–44; *Sources of the HA* (1978), 103–4. The 'Ignotus' theory is also accepted by Rubin, *Civil War Propaganda* (1988), 63–5 and *passim*, and is now the orthodox view enshrined in handbooks: H. W. Benario, *ANRW* 2.34.3 (1997), 2759–72; P. L. Schmidt in Herzog–Schmidt 4 (1997), 56–7. Most recently, see M. Kulikowski, *CQ* 57 (2007), 245.

[33] An example: we know that Marius Maximus included documents. According to Syme (*RP* 2. 653), the main source of the *HA* 'had not indulged in this practice'; therefore Marius Maximus cannot have been the main source. Another argument of the same kind is based on the *vita Veri*, which Barnes (*JRS* 57 (1967), 65–79) has shown to be based on good information and therefore to belong with the series of 'main' lives (cf. n. 20). Its source must therefore have been a life of Verus; but as Marius Maximus did not write one he cannot have been the main source (thus e.g. Syme, *RP* 2. 653–4). This argument begs the question in two

Birley, who has restated the case for Marius Maximus as the main factual source of the early lives in the *HA*.[34] But if we reject the idea of a hypothetical *doppelgänger* as improbable and unnecessary, we are still faced with the question of how closely the *HA* followed Marius Maximus. Nineteenth-century scholars such as Plew and Peter (see n. 28) argued that the *HA* relied exclusively on Marius Maximus, and that the extant text consists of little more than a series of excerpts from his work. But this may be too extreme, and no more helpful than the minimalist argument that he was used only occasionally for trivial details to supplement an *ignotus*. Even if we accept that the author of the *HA* made extensive use of Marius Maximus (as we think probable), it is likely enough that he drew upon additional sources as well. These could have included known figures such as Dio, Herodian, and Asinius Quadratus;[35] whether the *HA* includes information from later sources such as Ammianus Marcellinus, Aurelius Victor, and the hypothetical *Kaisergeschichte* of *c.*340 is more controversial, but certainly possible.[36]

Marius Maximus is also thought to have been used by the authors of the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and the *KG*. Certainly Marius' work was popular or came back into fashion in the fourth century.[37] But writers adopted a superior attitude: 'Vopiscus', in spite of having included Marius (in T9) among six 'truthful biographers', in T10 accuses him of extreme verbosity and being entangled in fable, and Ammianus Marcellinus in T11 deplores the fact that he was still being read, along with Juvenal. The 'long-winded' work, even if epitomized, eventually disappeared.

Modern assessments vary: Syme, drawing on Victor, Eutropius, and the *Epitome* as well as the *HA*, is dismissive; Marius wrote with the decline of dynasties his main theme and making a '*satura*'; he favoured 'the trivial, the anecdotic, or the scandalous'; he attacked even 'good' emperors such as Marcus and Pertinax, while he may have credited empresses such as Plotina, Faustina II, and Julia Domna with adultery and poisoning.[38] Birley (2710–13, 2718–20) is more favourable, denying any sharp distinction between biographers and annalists, notably in the material they included. And the interest of fourth-century readers may have been due to the rich prosopographical material the work contained (Birley 2681, 2723).

ways, first because it cannot be certain that the *vita Veri* is based on a distinct life of Verus (the necessary information could have been taken from the first book of Maximus' life of Marcus, as Birley (2712) suggests), and secondly because it is not certain that Marius Maximus did not write a separate life of Verus (this argument is based on Ausonius' *Caesares*, on which see above and n. 17). For discussion of a rather different circular argument see comm. on F6.

[34] Birley 2711–14, developing the points made in *Septimius Severus* (1971), 315–22; cf. G. Kerler, *Die Aussenpolitik in der HA* (Diss. Bonn, 1970), 117–23 and *passim*; Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 262–6; K.-P. Johne, *Kaiserbiographie und Senatsaristokratie* (Berlin, 1976), 73–6.

[35] The *HA* certainly used Herodian for later events, particularly the tumultuous year 238 (see General Introduction, I. 79). See J. Straub, *BHAC* (1970), 271–85; for the use of Dio, F. Kolb, *Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der HA* (Bonn, 1972); id, *HAC* 3 (1995), 179–91; *contra*: Barnes, *Sources of the HA* (1978), 80–9. Barnes also argues (108) that the *HA* did not use Asinius Quadratus directly (as suggested by Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 263); cf. comm. on Asinius Quadratus (no. 102) F25.

[36] On the possible use of later fourth-century sources by the *HA* see General Introduction, I. 79–80.

[37] T11; and see Cameron, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 372–3; Syme, *Emperors and Biography*, 15.

[38] Syme, *Ammianus and the HA*, 91; *HA Papers* (1983), 38–40. Of course Syme's low opinion of Marius Maximus is a natural consequence of his view that all the serious historical information in the *HA* goes back to the 'sober' Ignotus.

Uncertainty about the number and status of *HA* passages citing, referring to, or apparently implying a text of Marius remains. Hence Birley (2684–793), a champion of his contribution, has a longer list of fragments than Peter, makes more extended citations, and suggests passages that may be derived from him, as well as possible indications of Marian authorship (2714–18), such as ablative absolutes with the present participle or possible allusions to events in Marius' or his father's career (2721–3). All the categories need scrutiny and caution: those credited because the author of the *HA* was given to name-dropping, to shows of learning, and to demonstrably bogus source-citations, the anonymous because he claimed to use other sources and may well have done so (see above). In line with our generally conservative approach (see General Introduction, I. 15–20), we have included passages that are explicitly ascribed to Marius Maximus, and have admitted anonymous passages only in the cases of F7b, F8c, and F12b, where the close similarity of the language and content to named passages makes it virtually certain that they derive from him. We have also been generally cautious, as usual, in deciding how much of each passage should be attributed to Marius, indicated by the use of bold type. Where there is uncertainty, discussion of the issue will be found in the commentary.

The arrangement and ordering of the testimonia and fragments present particular problems in the case of Marius Maximus, and require a brief comment here. Many of the *HA*'s references to Marius Maximus describe aspects of the character or structure of all or part of his work, or make reference to its contents, but without quoting or paraphrasing particular passages of the text; indeed, in some cases the author gives reasons for not doing so—most obviously, reasons of length (T3, T4). Strictly speaking, such passages are testimonia rather than fragments, and we have therefore classifed them as such, in contrast to earlier editors, who have listed them as fragments.[39] The distinction seems to us both useful and serviceable, although in some cases it is somewhat artificial, as we freely admit. In at least one case it is not really applicable at all. This is *HA Alex.* 21.3–4, which we have printed as T8, a text that refers generically to passages where Marius Maximus spoke of emperors replacing their praetorian prefects by 'kicking them upstairs'. Specific examples of this practice are reported at *HA* [Spart.] *Hadr.* 8.7, [Capit.] *Pius* 10.6, and [Lampr.] *Comm.* 4.7, and Birley may be right to suggest that at least some of these passages derive from Marius Maximus.[40] The episodes as recorded seem authentic, and Chastagnol has used them as evidence that Marius Maximus was a source of serious information for the *HA*, not just of tittle-tattle, as the proponents of the Ignotus-theory maintain.[41]

The testimonia are listed in the order in which they appear in the *HA*. The one testimonium that is not from the *HA*, but from Ammianus Marcellinus, comes last

[39] Thus Tropea, Peter, and Birley, none of whom lists the testimonia, or attempts to distinguish them from fragments in the way that we have done, following Jacoby.

[40] The first two of these passages are printed by him as fragments (F4 and F10 in his arrangement), but surprisingly not the third, which in our view has at least as good a claim. Notice also the last sentence of T3 (=Birley F 20). As there is no certainty about any of them, we have not included them as fragments.

[41] Authenticity of reports: A. Chastagnol, *Recherches sur l'HA* (Paris, 1970), 39–45; 60–3; id., *Le Sénat romain à l'époque impériale* (Paris, 1992), 135–9; E. Van't Dack in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans* (Leuven, 1977), 332–6. Evidence for Marius Maximus as a source of serious facts: Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste* (1994), lvii–lviii.

(T11), not because we want to suggest that Ammianus wrote after the *HA* (we have no opinion on this issue, on which see n. 36), but because it deals with Marius' posthumous reputation, rather than directly with him or his work. The fragments, on the other hand, are listed in the order in which we think they appeared in Marius' work. Although only a few are explicitly assigned to the lives of particular emperors (F8b, F12a, F13, F17, with the fragment numbers indicated in bold type), the others can be assigned to their respective lives with a greater or lesser degree of probability. Where there is doubt, the issue is discussed in the commentary.

(BML, TJC)

102

Asinius Quadratus

Editions: Peter 2. clxxxv–clxxxvii, 142–7; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 97; M. Meckler, *BNJ* 97.

Principal discussions: E. Schwartz, 'Asinius (31) Quadratus' *RE* 2 (1896), 1603–4 (cf. P. von Rohden, 'C. Asinius (32) Quadratus', ibid. 1604); A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} 1 (1933), A 1245; W. von Christ, W. Schmid, O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*^{6} 2.2 (1924), 801; E. Manni, 'Asinio Quadrato e l'arcaismo erodoteo nel III secolo d. C.', in *Studi di storiografia antica in memoria di L. Ferrero* (Turin, 1971), 191–201; F. Paschoud, *Zosime: Histoire nouvelle* 3.1 (Paris, 1986), 204–5; P. M. M. Leunissen, *Konsulen und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.)* (Amsterdam, 1989), 147, 294, 356, 374; P. Herrmann, 'Inschriften von Sardeis', *Chiron* 23 (1993), 233–63, esp. 262 n. 9; G. Zecchini, 'Asinio Quadrato storico di Filippo l'Arabo', *ANRW* 2.34.4 (1998), 2999–3021.

INTRODUCTION

Life

The author has been variously identified with prominent individuals of the Severan age. One possibility is C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus (*PIR*^{2} 1, A 1244 = *RE* no. 29), who dedicated a monument to Caracalla on Amorgus (*IG* 12.7, 267 = *IGRR* 4.1013), and was himself honoured as a benefactor at Ephesus (*Inschr. Ephesos* 3040) and mentioned at Blaundus in an inscription set up by his son, C. Asinius Julianus (*IGR* 4.717); the latter two texts describe him as a consular (ὑπατικός). Leunissen (*Konsulen und Konsulare* (1989), 147) dates his consulship to the time of Commodus or Severus on the grounds that his son was C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus (A 1237 = *RE* no. 17), already governor of Asia under the Severi.[1]

A second possibility is C. Asinius Quadratus (*PIR*^{2} 1 A 1246 = *RE* no. 32), proconsul (presumably of Achaea) and consul designate, who was honoured at Olympia (T1). This identification was favoured by von Rohden in *RE* and by Stein in *PIR*^{2}, as well as by Jacoby and Dittenberger, who in his comment on T1 argued that the phrase 'in *word* and deed' referred to his historical writing (see further below). The two possibilities are not mutually exclusive alternatives, and it may be that all four texts refer to one and the same person, who was also our historian.

There may be a chronological difficulty in the fact that the history went down at least as far as Alexander Severus (T5), and if its title is taken literally, as Schwartz, Manni, and Zecchini insist it should be (see *Works*), it was written after AD 247, which

[1] This man belonged to a prominent family in Sardes, which is examined in detail by Herrmann, *Chiron* 23 (1993), 248–63, with a stemma (255). They were office-holders and benefactors of the city, and one of them who is honoured there claims many relatives who were not only members of the Roman senate but of consular rank.

is stretching things if he held his consulship under Commodus or Severus, and impossible if T1 alludes to the history as already written when he was consul designate. But there may be good reasons for not taking AD 247 as the *terminus post quem* (on which see below). A second difficulty is that the historian is described by Agathias (T4, F21) as Ἰταλίωτης, indicating that he came from southern Italy or Sicily, rather than from mainland Greece or Asia Minor.[2] But even if Agathias' statement is well founded (which is not to be taken for granted), it may mean only that the historian was born in Italy, or that the family, despite its eastern connections, was of Italian origin (thus Leunissen, *Konsulen und Konsulare* (1989), 356).

Taking all the evidence together, we could provisionally reconstruct his life as follows: Asinius Quadratus was a Roman consul, of Asian Greek descent and from a senatorial family of Ephesus and Sardes, perhaps born in Italy during the term of an office held by his father. His two major works were centred on Rome and Roman achievements, but he did not lose touch with his native city, even if he did not supervise the construction of the new 'Marble Court' at Sardes.[3] His own tours of duty had taken him to Achaea, or 'Hellas', as the backward-looking Sardians emotively called it,[4] where he became a benefactor. Quadratus seems to have kept in with the dangerous dynasty of the Severi, not coming too close to the centre, but making an offering with his brother to Caracalla (*IGR* 4.1013), the most dangerous of them, and perhaps encouraging the last, Severus Alexander, with an account of his predecessors' successes against the Parthians.

The alternative framework suggested by G. Zecchini, based on a date around 247 for the *Thousand-Year History*, is dealt with in the next section.

Works

Quadratus wrote a history in Ionic Greek (T5), apparently celebrating Rome's thousand-year-old empire. That at least is the implication of its title, variously reported as Χιλιέτηρις, Ῥωμαϊκὴ χιλιαρχία, or Ῥωμαϊκὴ χιλιάς (*Historiae* in the dubious F6). The concluding date for a thousand-year history, using the Varronian era, would be AD 247, which would place the historian a generation later than the inscriptions discussed in the previous section, although the possibility that he was writing in extreme old age should not be discounted. On the other hand the *Suda* states (T5) that it went only as far as Severus Alexander. This statement did not impress Schwartz, who dismissed it as a vague generalization and insisted on 247 as the *terminus post quem* for Asinius' work.[5] Jacoby, for his part, insisted that the *Suda*'s formal statement should be taken seriously; but he conceded that the work could have reached as far as Alexander Severus but then have been left unfinished.[6] This idea has

[2] Leunissen, *Konsulen und Konsulare* (1989), 356, with bibl. n. 25. One member of the family owned property at Drepanum: *IG* 14. 283–4 = *IGRR* 1. 502, with A. Brugnone, *Kokalos* 28–9 (1982–3), 388–94. Elsewhere in Agathias Ἰταλίωτης means simply Italian, for example where Italians are contrasted with the Franks (*Hist.* 2.14.11).

[3] *SEG* 36. 1094; the name of the *curator* of the city, described as 'governor of Hellas', is missing from the stone.

[4] See previous note, and Herrmann, *Chiron* 23 (1993), 233.

[5] Schwartz, *RE* 2. 1603; cf. Manni, *Studi Ferrero* (1971), 193–5; Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.34.4, 3001–4.

[6] Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2C (*Komm.*), 301; thus also T. D. Barnes, *JRS* 57 (1967), 72.

been developed by Zecchini, who uses it as the basis for his theory that the work was an officially sponsored history commissioned by Philip in 244 among other preparations for the celebration of Rome's millennium in 247.[7]

The alternative is to accept that Quadratus wrote under Severus Alexander, and either named his work prematurely, considering that a history covering 980 or so years was enough to justify the title *Χιλιετηρίς*,[8] or somehow contrived to start earlier than the Varronian date of 753 BC. It was Carl Müller who first suggested that he might have taken the first Olympic Games (traditionally 776 BC) as his starting point, and continued the thousand-year narrative to AD 224.[9] This would mean either that he pushed the foundation date back twenty-three years, or that he started his account twenty-three years before the actual foundation, perhaps with the accession of Numitor and the beginning of the foundation saga. This latter interpretation would entail rejecting the evidence of T5, or turning Schwartz's theory on its head, by taking as a vague generalization not the phrase *ἕως Ἀλεξάνδρου . . . Καίσαρος* but the words *ἀπὸ κτίσεως Ῥώμης*.

The temptation to go back to 776 BC would have been strong, if it created a history of exactly one thousand years; and there is a possibility that earlier universal historians had already been in the habit of synchronizing the foundation of Rome with the first Olympiad, in order to mark the start of historical time and to facilitate the tendency, which had become fashionable in the mid-second century, to equate world history with Roman history.[10] If Quadratus did begin his account with the first Olympiad, it would explain why he was thanked by the Eleans for honouring Olympia 'in word and deed' (T1).[11]

The work occupied fifteen books (T5) and was probably arranged chronologically. The town of Antium, which played an important part in the story of early Rome down to 338 BC, was mentioned in book 2 (F1), and the Ligurian and Spanish wars (presumably those of the second century BC) were narrated in book 5 (F2, and see comm. on F4). This would suggest that the scale of treatment expanded as the narrative approached the author's own time, in a manner comparable to other Roman historians, including his contemporary Cassius Dio. The first six centuries would have occupied the first five books, probably in brief summary, and the remaining four

[7] Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.34.4, 3003, 3014–15. Apart from the point that the title must refer to a real millennium, Zecchini's arguments are all circumstantial. For example he suggests (3005–8) that a commission from the emperor would accord with the political stance of the Asinii, who enjoyed the favour of Gordian III's father-in-law and praetorian prefect Timesitheus, and of his successor Philip. On the celebration of Rome's millennium in 247 see L. Polverini in *Festschrift K. Christ* (Darmstadt, 1988), 344–57.

[8] Christ-Schmid-Stählin[6] 2.2 (1924), 801; cf. F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 192.

[9] C. Müller, *FHG* 3, 659; Dittenberger *ad Syll.*[3] 887; Jacoby, *Komm.* 2C, 301; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar*, 87. Peter (2. clxxxxvi) offered the alternative suggestion that Quadratus adopted the foundation date of Castor of Rhodes (viz. 764 BC), which would have placed the millennium in 236.

[10] Jacoby on Chryseros *FGrHist* 96 T1; E. L. Bowie in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London 1974), 176. A residual trace of this practice perhaps survives in the chronicle of George Syncellus, where the foundation of Rome is placed in Ol. 1.1 (p. 318 Mosshammer). The statement of Schol. Eur. *Troades* 221, referred to by Jacoby in this connection, is hardly relevant: the scholion notes that some historians dated the foundation of Rome and Carthage *before* the first Olympiad; this is probably an allusion to Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 F60).

[11] Dittenberger ad loc.; *contra*: Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.34.4, 3003, arguing that the *λόγος* with which Asinius favoured the people of Olympia may have been an antiquarian treatise or an epideictic speech.

would have occupied the next ten books—i.e. two-thirds of the work.[12] This would be consistent with the evidence of F5, for example, which indicates a fair degree of detail in the narrative of the second century AD. F7–8 show that the work contained antiquarian and ethnographic details, and although its many geographical fragments (and those from the *Parthica*) reflect the interests of the citing authorities (principally Stephanus of Byzantium[13]), it is legitimate to deduce that they were works in which much geographical and ethnographic information could be found.

Quadratus' use of Ionic Greek (T5; cf. F2 and comm.; Jacoby rightly noted that T5 refers only to the *Χιλιετηρίς*) has suggested imitation of Herodotus and rivalry with his 'Thucydidean' contemporary Cassius Dio.[14] F8–11 suggest that his work continued long in use, and it is cited by Xiphilinus (F5).

Quadratus' history of Parthian affairs (*Parthica*) occupied at least nine books. It is cited mainly by Stephanus for the form of place names and their ethnic adjectives, but F16 and 25 show that it dealt with Rome's Parthian Wars, both because of their content and because in the latter (=T2) Quadratus is styled *belli Parthici scriptor*. It would not, however, be legitimate to take *bellum Parthicum* as a translation of the work's title, still less as an indication that it was exclusively concerned with just the one war referred to in the fragment (sc. that of L. Verus); more probably it gave a historical account of Rome's wars against Parthia down to (and possibly including) the campaign of Severus Alexander against the Sassanian Persians,[15] either starting with the earliest conflicts in the republic, or more probably, as Jacoby suggested, continuing the *Parthica* of Arrian (cf. T3 and F21), which went down to (and included) Trajan's Parthian War of 115–17. If so, the first Parthian War in Asinius Quadratus' account would have been that of L. Verus (thus, Zecchini, *ANRW* 2.34.4, 3009–10).

[12] Zecchini (*ANRW* 2.34.4, 3016) offers a different scheme, assigning book 1 to the monarchy, 2 to the republic to the end of the fourth century, 5 to the Punic Wars, 12 to Caesar (cf. comm. on F3), and 13–15 to the empire. He notes that the small proportion allocated to the empire would be less extreme than in Appian's work (three parts in twenty-four), and that it would have suited the archaizing taste of the second and third centuries (3018).

[13] Stephanus of Byzantium was a grammarian who taught in Constantinople, probably in the period from the end of the reign of Anastasius (491–518) to the early years of Justinian (527–65). He is known as the author of the *Ἐθνικά*, a work on place-names in sixty books, arranged as an alphabetical lexicon. It survives only in a later epitome (no earlier than the ninth century), and there is evidence of some interpolations. Stephanus' original lexicon contained a wide range of information including foundation legends and historical episodes, as well as etymologies, name-changes, and orthographical and morphological variations (his principal aim being to establish the correct form of ethnic adjectives). His examples were illustrated with quotations from geographers and historians, as well as grammarians and antiquarians, many of which have been reduced by the epitomator(s) to single sentences or to the one-word form of the name or ethnic used by the source. Asinius Quadratus is the only Roman historian in this edition to be cited by Stephanus, who probably consulted him at first hand. On Stephanus see *OCD*[4] 1400 (R. Browning), Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 362–3 (no. 144); D. Whitehead, *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantinus* (Stuttgart, 1994), 99–124.

[14] Schwartz, *RE* 2, 1603; Manni, in *Studi Ferrero* (1971), 191–201.

[15] Zecchini (*ANRW* 2.34.4, 3010) takes it down to 244, thus including the war in which Philip was involved, and which he brought to an end by making peace. The work, on this view, would have extended to ten or twelve books. Note, however, that it involves an increasing difficulty about the title *Parthica*: after 224 the Romans were dealing with Persians. Zecchini (3003) also links Philip's title *Germanicus Maximus* with a separate work, *Germanica*, by Asinius Quadratus (but see comm. on F8).

The fragments, mostly from Stephanus, refer to places in Armenia, Media, and Mesopotamia. It perhaps began with an ethno-geographical introduction (see comm. on F12), and also contained antiquarian asides. F26 mentions the foundation of Tigranocerta, which was the work of Tigranes II in 83 BC. This was probably part of a digression, as it is from book 9: the alternatives, that it occupied its chronological place in a massively detailed narrative occupying many more than nine books, or that the work was arranged geographically or according to some other non-chronological principle, seem far-fetched. On the other hand, it is not absolutely certain that it is from the *Parthica* (see comm.). That the work contained passing asides on peoples and places is likely enough, in view of F15 and 18 (from the *Parthica*, and cf. F7–8, probably from the *Χιλιετηρίς*). F23 also confirms that he had an interest in foundations, if the gloss is from Quadratus and not an addition by Stephanus.

That Quadratus also wrote separate works on the reign of Marcus Aurelius and on German affairs is a possible, but not a necessary, inference from F7 and 8 (respectively). See comm. ad locc.

(BML, TJC)

103

Aemilius Sura

Editions: Peter 2. ccx, 161.

Principal discussions: T. Mommsen, 'Mamilius Sura, Aemilius Sura, L. Manlius', *RhM* 16 (1861), 282–4 (=*Ges. Schr.* 7 (1909), 70–6); C. Trieber, 'Die Idee der vier Weltreiche', *Hermes* 27 (1892), 332–44, esp. 337–8; P. v. Rohden, 'Aemilius (147) Sura', *RE* 1 (1893), 590; M. Büdinger, *Die Universalhistorie im Altertum* (Vienna, 1895), 74–5; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 587–8, 833; J. S. Swain, 'The theory of the four monarchies: opposition history under the Roman empire', *CPh* 35 (1940), 1–21, esp. 1–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 195; 2 (1956), 91 n. 4; A. Momigliano, 'The origins of universal history', *ASNP* ser. 3, 12.2 (1982), 533–60 (=*Settimo contributo*, 77–103, esp. 87–8); J. M. Alonso-Núñez, 'Aemilius Sura', *Latomus* 48 (1989), 110–19.

INTRODUCTION

Life

Nothing is known of Sura's life; Mommsen considered him to be a contemporary of Sulla, but with what justification is not clear. The fact that he places the beginning of Roman supremacy at the time of Philip V and Antiochus III, and shortly after the defeat of Carthage (F1), has often been taken to indicate that he wrote before the Third Macedonian War and *a fortiori* before the sack of Carthage, but this is hardly compelling.[1] The majority of scholars, who do not regard Velleius Paterculus (F1) as having used Sura as his source,[2] but see the passage as an old gloss inserted into the text,[3] have been free to assign him to the empire: it is in remarking on the isolation of Livy in an age that avoided 'synthèse' that Bardon notes Sura.[4]

Work

Pliny *nat.* 1 cites a Mamilius Sura (otherwise known as a writer on plants, etc.) for books 8, 10–11, 17–19. Reifferscheid emended the *nomen* to Aemilius, but Peter

[1] Thus Büdinger, *Die Universalhistorie im Altertum* (1895), 75. The arguments are set out in full by Swain, *CPh* 35 (1940), 1–5. Alonso-Núñez (*Latomus* 48 (1989), 110–19), like Momigliano (*Settimo contributo*, 87–8), has Sura writing between 189 and 171 and sees him, inspired by Roman patriotism, taking over a scheme from the Greeks that might issue, for Jews in theocracy, for Romans in their own supremacy. This second-century dating is rebutted by Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 588; D. Mendels, *AJPh* 102 (1981), 330–7.

[2] So Mommsen, *RhM* 16 (1861), 282–4.

[3] First deleted by Delbeinius in the Aldine edition, according to W. S. Watt, *Velleii Paterculi Historiarum . . . libri duo* (Stuttgart, 1988), 4. See Trieber, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 337; Büdinger, *Die Universalhistorie im Altertum* (1895), 74–5.

[4] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 91, with n. 4.

condemned the change and it has not won acceptance.[5] The unusual title of Sura's work, *De annis populi Romani*, is given in F1, and it looks like a (summary?) history of Rome (to his own time?), or a work essentially on chronology and even one that played with number symbolism; cf. the content of F1, with its reference to the successive world empires, with the 'ages' of Rome referred to by Annaeus Seneca Maior (74 F2) and Vibius Maximus (90 T2). Bardon describes it as an 'ouvrage qui aurait contenu des vues generales sur l'histoire du monde'.[6] Mommsen had been more confident: it was an outline of world history somewhat similar to that of Velleius, arranged after the scheme of five dominant powers, of which the fifth was that of Rome.[7] The relationship between the chronology proposed by Sura and the scheme seems well established (see comm.), but Bardon denied Mommsen's view of the work any secure foundation; certainly the proportions of the work that it suggests do not fit the Romanocentric title.[8]

(BMI.)

[5] Peter 2. ccx, on A. Reifferscheid, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1860), xvi–xvii; rebutted also by J. Hellegouarc'h, in the Budé Velleius Paterculus, 1 (Paris, 1982), 29, and by L. Petersen, *PIR*[2] M 124.

[6] Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2. 91 n. 4.

[7] For the succession of world empires see Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 77–103 (biological interpretations of history 81–3; for further bibliography see J. M. Alonso-Núñez, *Latomus* 47 (1988), 122 n. 26).

[8] Mommsen, *RhM* 16 (1861), 282–4; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 1. 105; cf. Büdinger, *Die Universalhistorie im Altertum* (1895), 74.

104

Domitius

Principal discussions: E. Baehrens, 'Zum Origo Gentis Romanae', *NJPhP* 135 (1887), 769–82; H. Behrens, *Quaestiones de libello qui Origo gentis romanae inscribitur* (Greifswald, 1917); G. Puccioni, 'La tradizione annalistica romana nell'Origo gentis Romanae', *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 223–99, esp. 260–2; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 147; P. L. Schmidt, 'Das Corpus Aurelianum und S. Aurelius Victor', *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1583–676, esp. 1605–6.

INTRODUCTION

Domitius is cited three times in the *OGR* (F1a, 1b, 2). Only two Domitii are otherwise known as authors. Aulus Gellius mentions a famous grammarian of his time known as Domitius Insanus, who apparently deserved his nickname and caused Favorinus to observe that madness frequently afflicts the intelligent (Gell. 18.7.1); but he should probably be ruled out because all the known authors cited in the *OGR* are pre-Augustan. A more plausible candidate is the Domitius Calvinus whom Pliny lists in *nat.* 1 as a source for books 11 (on insects and animal and human anatomy) and 18 (on crops and agricultural matters).[1] In spite of Pliny's subject matter Domitius could well be a historian or antiquarian: among the sources for book 11 Pliny lists Domitius Calvinus between Cato the Censor and Trogus; and the list for book 18 also includes Cassius Hemina, L Piso, Trogus, and Tubero (as well as Cato, Varro, Verrius Flaccus, and Hyginus). But he cannot be identified more precisely among the known Domitii Calvini.[2]

Another possibility that has been raised by G. Forsythe (*Piso*, 122–3) is that he should be identified with Domitius Callistratus, a Greek author who wrote a history of Heraclea Pontica (*FGrHist* 433). Jacoby speculated that he acquired his Roman name having been brought to Rome as a prisoner in the Mithridatic Wars and subsequently freed (*RE* 10. 1748). What makes this plausible is that he is also credited with a history of Samothrace, which is quoted by Dionysius (1.68.2–4 = *FGrHist* 433 F10) in his discussion of the Penates, which supposedly originated in Samothrace (on this tradition see further Cassius Hemina 6 F7 and comm.). If Domitius Callistratus linked the Great Gods of Samothrace with the Roman Penates (as DH implies), he might also have said something about Aeneas' arrival in Italy, which could then have entered the Roman tradition (and therefore the *OGR*) through Varro (as Jacoby suggests for Dionysius). That would account for F1; on the other hand, it is

[1] First suggested by Behrens, *Quaestiones* (1917), 77–8, favoured by Richard, *OGR* 147, and D'Anna, *OGR* 97.

[2] An important branch of the aristocratic *gens Domitia*, the Calvini produced a consul in 332 BC (Varr.) and remained prominent in public life to the end of the republic (details in *RE* 5. 1419–25, Domitius nos. 40–5).

stretching things to suggest that F2 (the death of Aremulus Silvius) could have occurred in a history of Samothrace. Another difficulty is that one would not expect Domitius Callistratus, a Greek freedman, to be called simply Domitius; and Varro, if he is the source of DH 1.68.2, would have called him by his Greek name—all of which must cast doubt on this otherwise attractive hypothesis.

Of course it remains possible that the citations in the *OGR*, if genuine, are taken from an otherwise completely unknown Domitius.[3]

(CJS)

[3] The suggestion that the author was L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (*RE* 43), consul in 54 BC and enemy of Caesar (Baehrens, *NJPhP* 135 (1887), 774; Puccioni, *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 260; Schmidt, *RE* Suppl. 15, 1603) is rightly dismissed by Richard (*OGR*, 147). Ahenobarbus is not known to have written anything, and the evidence adduced in support of this theory is very weak. It is based on the idea that F1a (especially its etymology of Lavinium from *lauare*) casts Aeneas in a comic light, and therefore mocks the pretensions of Caesar. This is hardly compelling, but not as far-fetched as Suerbaum's idea that the citation is from an equally unattested work by the Pontifex Maximus Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 96 BC): in *Filologia e forme letterarie, Studi . . . F. Della Corte* 2 (Urbino, 1987), 500–1.

105

Egnatius

Principal discussions: G. Puccioni, 'La tradizione annalistica romana nell'Origo gentis Romanae', *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 233–99, esp. 264–5; P. L. Schmidt, 'Das Corpus Aurelianum und S. Aurelius Victor', *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1583–676, esp. 1605–6; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 180; D'Anna, *OGR* (1992), 129–30.

INTRODUCTION

Egnatius is an author known only from a single quotation in the *OGR* giving a bizarre variant of the story of Romulus and Remus. Attempts to identify Egnatius with known homonymous authors (a poet who wrote *de rerum natura* (Macrob. 6.5.2 and 12), or Egnatius Calvinus, an authority on Alpine birds (Pliny *nat.* 10.134)) are not persuasive, and there is no good reason to emend the text (for example by changing Egnatius to Veratius, as suggested by Puccioni). We have to admit that, subject to the usual provisos about citations in the *OGR*, Egnatius is the otherwise unknown author of a work of unknown scope, but one that occupied more than one book (F1).

(CJS)

106

Juventius Martialis

Editions: Peter 2. ccx.

Principal discussions: E. Diehl, 'Iuventius (117) Martialis', *RE* 10 (1917), 1367; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 206; L. Petersen, *PIR*^{2} (1966), I 883.

INTRODUCTION

Juventius Martialis is known as the author of a historical work that dealt with Julius Caesar, attested in T1 (where some MSS render the name *iuuencii* or *uiuenci* and *edideras* is almost certainly corrupt). Bardon (*Litt. inconnue* 2. 206) ranges him with other Antonine historians such as L. Ampelius and Granius Licinianus. Nothing can be concluded from his position in Sidonius' list after Suetonius, unless we accept that he is drawing a generic distinction between the highly wrought works of Livy, Martialis, and Suetonius, and the notebooks of Caesar's contemporary Cornelius Balbus (no. 41).

Whether Martialis wrote a full-scale history of the Caesarian age or a biography is not clear; perhaps the second, since accounts of the fall of the republic were not lacking and he is specially mentioned; Diehl (*RE* 10. 1367) postulates an 'umfangreiche (und wortreiche?) Geschichte Caesars'. However, Sidonius may have chosen to specify his three authors precisely because they wrote different types of work.

(BML)

107

M. Octavius

Principal discussions: H. Behrens, *Quaestiones de libello qui Origo gentis romanae inscribitur* (Greifswald, 1917); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* I (1952), 307; G. Puccioni, 'La tradizione annalistica romana nell'Origo gentis Romanae', *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 233–99, esp. 283–4; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 149; P. L. Schmidt, 'Das Corpus Aurelianum und S. Aurelius Victor', *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1583–676, esp. 1605–6; D'Anna, *OGR* (1992), 98–9.

INTRODUCTION

M. Octavius has been variously identified with the grammarians Octavius Lampadio and Octavius Teucer, with Octavius Musa (I. Appendix 1, A28), with Octavius Ruso (no. 48), but most frequently with Octavius Hersennius, known from Macrobius (*sat.* 3.12.7) as the author of a work *De sacris saliaribus Tiburtium* ('Concerning the Salian rituals of Tibur').[1] This man may be M. Octavius Herennus, mentioned elsewhere by Macrobius (3.6.11, citing Masurius Sabinus) as the builder of a temple to Hercules Victor (the same anecdote in Serv. *Aen.* 8.363, citing Varro).[2] The fact that the two citations in the *OGR* refer to rituals (but admittedly not to the Salii or to Tibur) may favour this identification, but in that case M. Octavius would not qualify as a historian. If not, his identity remains completely uncertain, as does the character of his work (although F1 implies more than one book), and he must in any case be subject to the usual doubts that surround quotations in the *OGR*.

(CJS)

[1] The various possibilities are set out by Richard, *OGR* 149. Octavius Hersennius (W. Kroll, *RE* 17, 1830) is favoured by Puccioni, *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 284; see also Behrens, *Quaestiones*, 76.

[2] See the important discussion of Coarelli, *Foro Boario*, 191–6. Coarelli dates Octavius Herennus (perhaps to be emended to Herennius) to the later second century BC, and suggests that he may be identical with M. Octavius, the tribune who opposed Tiberius Gracchus in 133, or, if he is not in fact the same man, the M. Octavius who repealed Gaius Gracchus' *lex frumentaria* (Cic. *Brut.* 222; *off.* 2.72). For criticism of these theories see A. Ziolkowski, *Phoenix* 42 (1988), 317–27, 331–3, although Ziolkowski accepts (322 n. 49) that M. Octavius Herennus may be the author referred to in the *OGR*.

108

Rubellius Blandus

Editions: Peter 2. ccx, 161.

Principal discussions: P. von Rohden, H. Dessau, *PIR* (1898), R 80; H. G. Brzoska, 'Blandus (2)', *RE* 3 (1897), 557–8; Schanz–Hosius, 2[4] (1935), 355; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 85–6; R. Syme, 'The marriage of Rubellius Blandus', *AJPh* 102 (1983), 62–85 (= *RP* 4. 177–98).

INTRODUCTION

The historian Rubellius Blandus is known only from the one fragment (F 1), where he is quoted together with Claudius Quadrigarius (both styled *historici*) for a detail of south Italian geography. The family of the Rubellii Blandi have been carefully analysed by Syme.[1] They achieved prominence under Tiberius when C. Rubellius Blandus became suffect consul in AD 18, and in 33 was married to Julia, the daughter of Drusus Caesar.[2] Tacitus notes with some surprise that a princess was thus united with a man whose grandfather had been a Roman knight from Tibur (*ann.* 6.27.1). Syme identifies the father with C. Rubellius L.f., attested as a proconsul of Crete and Cyrene under Augustus.[3] The grandfather would therefore have been L. Rubellius Blandus, possibly the brother of the C. Rubellius who is mentioned by Cicero in a letter of 43 BC.[4] The *nomen* Rubellius is rare, and the *cognomen* Blandus unknown in any other senatorial or equestrian family.[5] It is therefore likely, and is taken as certain by Syme, that the equestrian grandfather of the consul of 18 was identical with Blandus the rhetor, the first Roman knight to teach at Rome according to the elder Seneca.[6] The Rubellii are an interesting example of an Italian municipal family that prospered under the first emperors and achieved the highest offices and intermarriage with the imperial house. This led to disaster in 62, when Nero ordered the death of Rubellius Plautus, the son of Rubellius Blandus the consular and Julia. But other members of the family survived. A daughter, Rubellia Bassa, married the maternal uncle of the emperor Nerva,[7] and another descendant was presumably the Rubellius

[1] *AJPh* 102 (1983), 62–85 = *RP* 4. 177–98.

[2] Rohden–Dessau, *PIR* R 82; A. Nagl, *RE* 1A. 1158–9 (no. 5); W. Eck, *RE* Suppl. 14, 588–9 (no. 5).

[3] *AE* (1960), 266; cf. *AE* (1975), 305; Syme, *AJPh* 102 (1983), 66; W. Eck, *RE* Suppl. 14, 588 (no. 4).

[4] Cic. *fam.* 12.26.1 (but note that Shackleton Bailey prints *Rubellinum*, following the best MS; see Syme, *AJPh* 102 (1983), 65 n.19); Münzer, *RE* 1A. 1157 (no. 1), identifying him with the rhetor.

[5] Syme, *AJPh* 102 (1983), 75 (Rubellius), 65 (Blandus).

[6] Sen. *contr.* 2 *pr.* 5. He was the teacher of the Augustan orator and philosopher Papirius Fabianus (*PIR*[2] P 112). Blandus would have been a contemporary of Passienus (father of the consul of AD 4) and Q. Haterius according to Syme (*AJPh* 102 (1983), 65, 78–9), who also speculates that he might have instructed the young Tiberius (cf. Syme, *AA* 354).

[7] *ILS* 952: *Rubellia Blandi f. Bassa Octaui Laenatis*. *PIR* R 86; Nagl, *RE* 1A. 1161 (no. 9); Syme, *Tacitus*, 627.

Blandus satirized as a decadent aristocrat by Juvenal.[8] At least one other Rubellius Blandus reached the consulship at an unknown date (*CIL* 6.14421). The historian of F1 must have been a member of this family, but cannot be more closely identified or dated.[9] Peter was right to classify him among the historians of unknown date, and we have followed suit.

(BML, TJC)

[8] Juv. *sat.* 8.39–40, with Syme, *AJPh* 102 (1983), 81–3. *PIR* R 79; Nagl, *RE* 1A. 1157–8 (no. 3). Other descendants of the family: Syme, *Tacitus*, 628.

[9] Syme (*AJPh* 102 (1983), 74) is inclined to identify him with either the consul of 18 or his grandfather the rhetor, but in the knowledge that it could have been anyone ('anything can happen in a long life').

109

Anonymus 1 (*POxy* 2088)

Editions (mostly with discussion; some items do no more than reprint earlier texts): A. S. Hunt, *POxy* 17 (1927), 113–15 (photo. pl. III); M. A. Levi, 'Servio Tullio nel POxy. 2088', *RFIC* 56 (1928), 511–15; A. Piganiol, 'Le Papyrus de Servius Tullius', in *Scritti in onore di B. Nogara* (Vatican City, 1937), 373–80; A. Calderini, *Papiri latini* (Milan, 1945), 67–8; G. Lugli, *Fontes ad topographiam ueteris urbis Romae pertinentes*, 1 (Rome, 1952), 74 no. 7; R. Cavenaile, *Corpus papyrorum Latinorum* (Wiesbaden, 1958), 120–1, no. 41; R. Seider, *Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri*, 2.1 (Stuttgart, 1978), 49–50; Thomsen, *King Servius* (1980), 13–16 (cf. 127–8, 219–20); G. Traina, 'Il papiro di Servio Tullio', *ASNP* ser. 3.17 (1987), 389–406; F. Coarelli, *LTUR* 4. 208 (lines 14–17 only); G. Ammanati, 'Il papiro di Servio Tullio (P. Oxy. 2088): una nuova interpretazione', *MD* 66 (2011), 93–120..

Principal discussions: L. Castiglioni, review of Levi, *BFC* 35 (1928–9), 212–13; V. Arangio Ruiz, 'La riforma dell' ordinamento centuriato', *Scritti dedicati al Prof. C. Arnò* (Modena, 1928), 3–13, at 12–13 n. 1 = *Scritti di diritto romano* 2 (Naples, 1974), 205–15, at 214–15 n. 1; E. Volterra, review of E. Sereni, *Comunità rurali nell' Italia antica*, *Iura* 7 (1956), 239–48, at 246; L. R. Taylor, 'The centuriate assembly before and after the reform', *AJPh* 78 (1957), 337–54, at 341 n. 10; F. Heichelheim, 'Pap. Oxy. 2088, a fragment from Cato's *Origines*?', *Aegyptus* 37 (1957), 250–8; P. de Francisci, *Primordia ciuitatis* (Rome, 1959), 673–4; A. Magdelain, 'Remarques sur la société romaine archaique', *REL* 49 (1971), 103–27, at 110–11; A. Grandazzi, 'La *Roma quadrata*: mythe ou réalité?', *MEFRA* 105 (1993), 493–545, at 508–11; Cornell, *Beginnings* (1995), 175–6; C. Nicolet, 'Les Listes des centuries: la prétendue centurie *ni quis sciuit*', *MEFRA* 113 (2001), 723–34 (supersedes *AEHE* 4e sect. (1974–5), 378–81).

INTRODUCTION

For full discussion of this text and its possible author see commentary.

(JB)

110

Anonymus 2 (*POxy* 30)

Editions and discussions. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 1 (1898), 59–61; H. Diels, *SPAW* (1898), 497–8; W. Crönert, *APF* 1 (1901), 119–20; H. J. M. Milne, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum* (London, 1927), 93 (no. 121); Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 326–7; E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini antiquiores* 2 (Oxford, 1935), 26, 50 (no. 207) (2nd edn., Oxford, 1972), 26, 52, 58; O. Seel, *Pompeius Trogus: fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1956), fr. 137; M. P. Brown, *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600* (London, 1990), 22–3; L. D. Reynolds, N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*^{3} (Oxford, 1991), 34.

INTRODUCTION

Although found at Oxyrhynchus, published in *POxy*, catalogued as a papyrus, and discussed in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, this fragment is in fact part of a parchment codex. Grenfell and Hunt declared it 'impossible to refer the fragment to a period earlier than the third century'; Lowe initially placed it in that century, but in the second edition of *CLA* 2 assigned it to the previous one, while Reynolds–Wilson and Brown date it to the turn of the first and second centuries AD. If the latter are right, it is the earliest known example of a parchment codex.

The recto is totally legible (see particularly Brown's plate), the verso, reproduced only by Lowe, scarcely legible at all; we have printed Grenfell and Hunt's transcription of the latter, with such supplements as seem certain, but without reproducing the subscript dots used to indicate letters which are not fully legible.

The script is described by Lowe as a mixture of rustic capitals, uncials, and cursive, though in the heading to the entry there is no mention of cursive (Brown's heading 'Literary Cursive' is certainly misleading).

Grenfell and Hunt thought that the occurrence of the names of Philip and Antiochus suggests that 'the subject of the composition was the Macedonian Wars of Rome'. This phrase has had a lasting legacy: Milne described it as a 'historical fragment on the Macedonian wars of Rome', Lowe as *fragmentum de bellis Macedonicis*; Reynolds and Wilson went further, talking of 'the anonymous *De Bellis Macedonicis*', while Brown has '*De Bellis Macedonicis* (fragment of a lost work, in Latin, on the Macedonian Wars of Rome)'. In fact the fragment appears to be concerned only with the war between Rome and Antiochus, not with the First and Second Macedonian Wars; Philip was probably mentioned because he took Rome's side against Antiochus. Nor, even though the Seleucids were of Macedonian descent and their phalanx was often described as 'Macedonian' (cf. Briscoe, *Comm.* 2. 248), would a Roman have called the war with Antiochus *bellum Macedonicum*. It is, of course, quite likely that the author did describe the wars against Macedon, but a work concerned only with

those and that against Antiochus would have dealt with the latter at far greater length than the fragment indicates. The likelihood is, therefore, that it formed part of a wider history of Rome, in which the war against Antiochus was included.

The average length of the lines (see next paragraph and below on verso ll. 8–9) and, therefore, the extent of the lacunae is quite uncertain. Equally uncertain are the date and identity of the author. Diels, in a rare and unfortunate excursion into Latin, thought it might be a fragment of Ennius. This was based on the fact that words are not divided between lines, and on Diels's claim that the recto contains hexameter endings and that what survives of the verso could be from earlier parts of hexameter lines. That is impossible: of the nine line-ends which survive or can be restored with certainty (for metrical purposes it makes no difference whether *Antiochus* or *Antiochi* is read in l. 9; see below) only ll. 6 and 8 have dactyl+spondee; ll. 3, 5, and 7 are *spondaizontes* and ll. 1 and 2 (Ennius never lengthens *-que*) do not have possible hexameter endings. Even if the latter were not the case, *spondaizontes* constitute only 2–3 per cent of the surviving lines of the *Annales* (cf. Skutsch, *Ennius*, 51) and only at 116–17 Sk are there two such lines in succession, explained by the fact that they contain adjectives derived from the names of goddesses: it would be inconceivable that three of five successive lines should be *spondaizontes*. On the verso l. 2 can only be made to scan by assuming that Ennius lengthened the last syllable of *hieme*, while l. 7 (see below) cannot form part of a hexameter. In any case, the Latin of the fragment bears no resemblance to that of Ennius.

Grenfell and Hunt thought the author might be Pompeius Trogus. If Goodyear (*PACA* 16 (1982), 1–2 = *Papers on Latin Literature* (London, 1992), 210–11) were right to think that the work of Justin was a florilegium, not an epitome of Trogus, that could not be the case. But Yardley's demonstration (*Justin and Pompeius Trogus: A Study of the Language of Justin's Epitome of Trogus* (Toronto, etc., 2003), ch. 5) that Justin's work contains a significant number of words which do not occur in Augustan Latin makes it virtually certain that he was wrong, and the possibility that Trogus was the author cannot be totally excluded. It is, however, unlikely, because of the form *auxileis* (verso l. 9): such forms of the dative and ablative plural are archaic (cf. Kühner–Holzweissig 122) and this is the only example of it for *auxilium*. It is hard to credit it to Trogus (it is of no significance that Justin 31.8.5 has *Eumenes rex cum auxiliis occurrit*; see comm.) and it would be a strange scribal error. The author is more likely to be a deliberate archaizer, like Claudius Quadrigarius and Sisenna (the scale of the treatment precludes Quadrigarius himself), but perhaps of the second century AD.

(JB)

APPENDIX 1

EXCLUDED AUTHORS AND WORKS

The present work collects the fragments of the Roman writers of histories, political biographies, and memoirs. For further information on the criteria for inclusion see I. 7–10 above. Peter included a number of authors and works which do not satisfy these criteria and have accordingly been excluded from this collection, as have other authors who are sometimes taken as historians but whose credentials are doubtful or at best marginal. This appendix gives brief details on all such excluded authors.

A1 Annaeus Seneca Minor, L.

Peter 2. cxxviii, 98; O. Rossbach, 'L. Annaeus (17) Seneca', *RE* 1 (1899), 2240–8; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 707; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 169; Griffin, *Seneca* (1976).

Seneca the philosopher (*c.*4 BC–AD 65) did not touch history, only selecting innumerable *exempla* for his protreptic purpose (F. Préchac, *RPh* 61 (1935), 361–70; 66 (1940), 247–53). He did, however, write a biography of his father (see Seneca Maior 75 T1), whom he clearly revered, unless, as has been suggested, this work is really part of the introduction to his edition of his father's *Histories*, left unpublished at his death (T. A. Sussmann, *The Elder Seneca* (Leiden, 1978), 144, with n. 23, following Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 340 and 398). Even if it was a separate memoir, it would hardly count as a political biography, and although the younger Seneca shared material from public life with the historians and his style has been thought to have influenced first-century historical writing (Syme, *Tacitus*, 141), he can hardly be included in an edition of lost historians. (BML)

A2 Annius Fetialis

Peter 1[2]. cccxxix, 317; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 167–72; v. Rohden, 'Annius (43) Fetialis', *RE* 1 (1894), 2265; Schanz–Hosius, 2[4]. 649; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 108 n.2.

Annius Fetialis is listed by Pliny, *nat.* 1, as a source for books 16, 33, and 36, but curiously not for book 34, where the one surviving fragment is quoted (*nat.* 34.29). According to this text Annius maintained that the statue on the Velia of a young girl on horseback, normally believed to be Cloelia (thus Piso 11 F24, also cited here), was actually of Valeria, the daughter of Publicola, and that she alone of the hostages delivered to Porsenna managed to escape, by swimming across the Tiber. Valeria is also mentioned as one of the hostages in DH 5.32.3–35.2, and in Plut. *Popl.* 18.2 and *mul. virt.* 14 (250 CF), and Plutarch notes that some authorities identify her as the girl on the horse. Münzer believed that the variant was invented by Valerius Antias (so too

Wiseman, *Roman Drama*, 84) and that Annius Fetialis, who followed Antias, was known to Pliny only through Varro. But neither assumption is compulsory; Valeria could have been part of the earliest tradition, and known to Annius Fetialis independently of Antias (thus Forsythe, *Piso*, 255), and nothing requires us to believe that Fetialis was known to Pliny only through Varro. Indeed it is perfectly possible to date Annius Fetialis to the early imperial period, when the name is attested epigraphically: *CIL* 15.796 (thus v. Rohden and Schanz–Hosius). In any case, it is not at all clear that Annius Fetialis was a historian rather than an antiquarian (thus Bardon), writing for example on the monuments of the city of Rome. (CJS)

A3 Anteius Rufus, P.

Peter 2. cxxxi; E. Groag, *PIR*^{2} A (1933), 731; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 169–70; M. T. Griffin, *Nero. the End of a Dynasty* (London, 1984), 471.

Anteius, whose *cognomen* Rufus is ascribed to him by Groag on the basis of inscriptions found in his province, governed Dalmatia in AD 51. His closeness to Agrippina earned Nero's hatred, and in 66 he was accused by the exiled P. Antistius Sosianus of having consulted both Nero's and his own horoscope, whereupon he killed himself (Tac. *ann.* 16. 15. 2). Sosianus had intercepted Anteius' correspondence with the exiled astrologer Pammenes, and stole from Pammenes notebooks in which Anteius' horoscope and destiny were hidden, and discovered a work on the birth and life of M. Ostorius Scapula (cos. suff. 59). In the view of Peter and Bardon, Anteius had written an encomiastic biography of Ostorius which implicitly criticized Nero by contrast. The nature of the work is not clear, however, as Groag and Griffin noted. The context is of writings on future destiny. Anteius may have been a student of astrology. Tacitus does not even say that the work was written by Anteius; perhaps, as Griffin suggests, it had been sent to Pammenes by its subject. (BML)

A4 Antistius Vetus, L.

Peter 2. cxxxviii–cxxxx; E. Wölfflin, *JAW* 3 (1877), 772; Fabia, *Sources de Tacite* (1893), 339; P. von Rohden, 'L. Antistius (53) Vetus', *RE* 1 (1893), 2559–60; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 130–1; E. Groag, *PIR*^{2} A (1933), 776; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 143.

An L. Vetus is mentioned by Pliny *nat.* 1 among the sources for books 3–6, '*geographicorum*', as Peter points out. Pliny invariably places him between (C. Julius) Hyginus (64) and Pomponius Mela, whose work coincided with Claudius' invasion of Britain (43–4). The three authors are listed on all four occasions together with Licinius Mucianus (A27, below), and twice (5 and 6) with both Mucianus and Domitius Corbulo (84). Wölfflin therefore supposed that Vetus was their contemporary, and an author of *commentarii*. His suggestions for the content are unpersuasive, however, and his view was rejected by Münzer, who thinks rather of

works like those of Hyginus and Mela. Peter does not commit himself to either view. Fabia argued that, for Tacitus, L. Vetus was a writer of memoirs, but a mine exploited by others and ignored by him. The case seems weak, even without the question of identity. Our author may be identical with L. Antistius Vetus (cos. 55), who committed suicide in 66 (the most economical hypothesis, given his placing in Pliny's index, and accepted by v. Rohden and Groag); but he is not credited with any campaigns in Germany and is known only to have begun construction of a canal, which he was unable to complete (Tac. *ann.* 13.53.2–4). He may have written on geography, water engineering, or river management. (BML)

A5 Antoni[n]us Julianus

Peter 2. cxxxxv–cxxxxvi, 108–9; J. Bernays, 'Über die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus' (*Jahresh. des jüd.-theol. Seminars in Breslau*, 1861), in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* ed. H. Usener (Berlin, 1885), 2. 80–200, esp. 172–3; E. Hertlein, 'Antonius Julianus, ein römischer Geschichtsschreiber?', *Philologus* 77 (1921), 174–93; A. Stein, *PIR*^{2} I (1933) A 843; cf. 844 and 846; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 649, 833, 835; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 205–6; J. J. Wilkes, 'Julio-Claudian historians', *CW* 65 (1972), 177–203, esp. 181–2.

The grounds for including Antoni(n)us Julianus in an edition of fragmentary historians are extremely weak. He is mentioned by Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 33.4, where Antoninus is the reading of the MSS) together with Flavius Josephus as the author of a work 'on the Jews' (*de Iudaeis*), but the text is corrupt and its meaning is not clear. Peter, following Bernays, argued that his work was a history of the Jewish War of 66–73, and that it was used by Tacitus, *hist.* 5.1–13. But both assumptions are speculative, as indeed is Bernays' view (again followed by Peter) that the author is to be identified with M. Antonius Julianus, the procurator of Judaea who was a member of the *consilium* summoned by Titus to discuss the fate of the Temple after the fall of Jerusalem in August 70 (Jos. *BJ* 6.236–8). Others have suggested that Antonius Julianus was the second-century Spanish rhetor of that name mentioned by Aulus Gellius (15.1), and that his work was a history of the Bar-Kokhba revolt (F. Münter, *Der jüdische Krieg unter den Kaisern Trajan und Hadrian* (Altona, 1821), 12; cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ* I (2nd edn., rev. F. Millar, G. Vermes, Edinburgh, 1973), 34; *contra*: Stein, *PIR*^{2} A 844). But it is equally possible that our author is not identifiable with any other known Antonius Julianus, and that the work was not a history at all (thus e.g. Hertlein, *Philologus* 77 (1921), 174–93, arguing for a theological work of the first or second century). In the present state of the evidence it seems best to suspend judgement on the identity of the author, and not to include him in this edition in the absence of positive reasons for doing so. (BML)

A6 Aquilius Regulus, M.

E. Groag, *PIR* ² A (1933), 1005; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 651 f., 832, 852; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 169 n., 201 f., 207; Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (1966), 54–5, 93–4, 134, 356–7.

Unreservedly backing emperors made Aquilius hateful to many senators. Tacitus reports attacks in 70 by the victims of Nero (Tac. *hist.* 4.42). He continued as a favourite of Domitian and was loathed by Pliny; references in his protégé Martial (e.g. 6.38) are more favourable. Much of his work will have consisted of speeches, but in 97 he composed an attack (Pliny *epist.* 1.5.2) on the memory of Arulenus Rusticus (A26) and Herennius Senecio (91), and in 104 a eulogy or biography (Pliny *epist.* 4.7.1 f., cf. 4.2) of his own deceased son, of which he distributed a thousand copies, which Sherwin-White (270) says 'might be a lengthy *laudatio* in the style of a funeral oration, a *consolatio* . . . or a full-scale life' (difficult to envisage for a *puer*). Regulus died not long after his son. (BMI.)

A7 Asconius Pedianus, Q.

Peter 2. cxxxxvi, 109; id., *Gesch. Lit.* (1897), 1. 114; G. Wissowa, 'Q. Asconius (3) Pedianus', *RE* 2 (1896), 1524–7; Stein, *PIR*² 1 (1933), A 1206; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 731–2, 858; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 150, 169; P. K. Marshall, *OCD*³ (1996), 188–9; see also General Introduction, I. 48–9.

Q. Asconius Pedianus (9 BC–AD 76 or AD 3–88) was the author of a number of scholarly works, including a partially extant commentary on the speeches of Cicero (written probably 54–7). Eusebius–Jerome says that he was considered a famous historical writer (*ad a. 2091 Abr.* (=AD 76), 188 Helm: *scriptor historicus clarus habetur*), but Peter argued—rightly, we think—that this must refer to the high reputation of the commentary, which deals almost exclusively with historical matters (cf. J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York, 1981), 37), rather than to an otherwise unknown historical work. Ps.-Acro (on Hor. *sat.* 1.2.41) quotes from a life of Sallust by Asconius, but this would belong to the category of literary biographies which we have excluded from this edition of historical fragments. (BML)

A8 Aurunculeius Cotta, L.

Peter 2. lxi, 45–6; Schanz–Hosius 1⁴ (1927), 97, 349, 615; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 281.

Aurunculeius Cotta served as a legate under Caesar in Gaul, and was killed in the revolt of the Eburones in 54 BC (Caes. *BGall.* 5.37.4). Athenaeus 6.105 mentions a work in Latin by him on the Roman constitution (*περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας*), in which he stated that Caesar took only three slaves with him on his expedition to

Britain. The context is moderation and restraint in public life, and Caesar is compared by Athenaeus to Scipio Africanus, who went on campaign with only five slaves. This would be perfectly appropriate in a work on constitutional practice, and there is no reason to follow Peter and Schanz–Hosius in thinking that the work was historical in character.

It is not clear whether Aurunculeius Cotta is the Cotta referred to by Cicero in *Att.* 13.44.3 (see Casca, A10 below). If not, the nature of the work referred to there is even more uncertain. (CJS)

A9 Baebius Macer

Peter 2. c, 71–2; Stein, *PIR*^{2} B (1933), 21; Wissowa, 'Baebius (31) Macer', *RE* 2 (1896), 2731; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 327–8; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 99.

Two fragments of Baebius Macer cited by Servius deal (respectively) with the comet that appeared at the funeral games for Caesar in 44 BC (Serv. (DS), *ecl.* 9.46) and with the equipment carried by boys in the *lusus Troiae* (Serv. (DS), *Aen.* 5.557). But there is no compelling reason to think that they are taken from a work of history or biography, especially as Fulgentius cites a third fragment (*serm. ant.* 6) concerning an obscure feature of sacrificial ritual, namely the *ambegni*, the two lambs that were bound on either side of a sacrificial victim in some ceremonies (cf. Paul. Fest. 4; Varr. *ling.* 7.31). The three fragments together suggest a work on religious antiquities, which appears to be confirmed by the fact that Fulgentius describes Baebius' work as *festalia sacrorum* ('matters relating to the sacral calendar'). His date is uncertain, unless (as is perfectly possible) he is to be identified with the Baebius Macer who corresponded with Pliny (*epist.* 3.5), was suffect consul in 103, and served as prefect of the City in 117 (on whom see Groag, *PIR*^{2} B (1933), 20; P. v. Rohden, *RE* 2. 2731 (no. 32); Syme, *Tacitus*, 666–7; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 215–16). (CJS)

A10 Caecina, A.

G. Schmeisser, *Die etruskische Disciplin im Bundesgenossenkriege bis zum Untergang des Heidentum* (Liegnitz 1881); Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 244–5; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1935), 350, 516, 601, 602; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 283, 314 f.; Cornell, 'Etruscan historiography', *ASNP* ser. 3, 6 (1976), 411–39, esp. 435–8; Rawson, 'Caesar, Etruria and the *Disciplina Etrusca*', *JRS* 68 (1978), 132–52, esp. 137–9 (= *Roman Culture*, 289–323, esp. 297–9).

Caecina was a friend of Cicero who wrote attacks on Caesar and in 48 was exiled to Sicily. Apart from his political works he studied Etruscan lore (thunder and lightning), which he had learned from his father, and his writings achieved great authority. His influence extended to Verrius Flaccus, Seneca, and Pliny, who cites Caecina's *De etrusca disciplina* in *nat.* 1 as a source for book 2 (on the world and its natural properties). Although this work undoubtedly contained historical and legendary material (e.g. Schol. Veron. *ad Aen.* 10.200), it was hardly a historical work (as

supposed by J. Heurgon, *La Vie quotidienne chez les Etrusques* (Paris, 1961), 306; *contra*: Cornell, *ASNP* ser. 3, 6 (1976), 437), and there is no good reason to regard Caecina as a historian. (BML)

A11 Casca

Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* 5 (1966), 382–3; Broughton, *MRR* 3 (1986), 194–5.

Writing to Atticus in July 45 BC, Cicero refers to three books simply by their author's names: Cotta, which he asks Atticus to send, Libo, which he has with him, and Casca, which he had had earlier: *Cottam me uelim mittas; Libonem mecum habeo et habueram ante Cascam* (*Att.* 13.44.3). Libo must be a reference to the *Annals* of Scribonius Libo (37), which might suggest that the other two works were also historical in character. But it equally might not. The question is especially obscure because we do not know what Cicero's purpose was in consulting them. It may have had something to do with his proposal, mentioned at the start of the letter, to write something to Caesar (thus Shackleton Bailey ad loc.). But this is neither certain nor (if correct) particularly helpful. The identity of the two authors is also in doubt. That Cicero was referring to Aurunculeius Cotta (A7) is a pure conjecture; there were lots of Cottae. As for Casca, T. J. Cadoux points out (*ap.* Broughton, *MRR* 3. 194–5) that three men with that *cognomen* were active in public life at this date (only two of them with the gentile name Servilius); any one of them might have been the author mentioned by Cicero. In any case, the grounds for taking him (or Cotta) as a historian are slight indeed. (CJS)

A12 Claudius Balbillus, Ti.

Peter 2. cxxxxiii, 107–8; Cichorius, *RS* (1922), 394–5; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 656, 835, 863; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1935), 143.

Balbillus, an *eques* perhaps from Ephesus or Alexandria, was prefect of Egypt from 55 to 59 and a courtier under Claudius and Nero. He is described by Seneca (*Q. nat.* 4.2.13) as exceptionally gifted in every branch of literature; Cichorius (*RS* 393) identified fragments of his *Astrologumena*. Other works may have included history, but there is no evidence for it. The account of Balbillus' speedy arrival in Alexandria in 55 (Pliny *nat.* 19.3) might be autobiographical, but the context suggests an official report. On the other hand, the Seneca passage suggests a collection of wonders such as C. Licinius Mucianus (A27) produced; this is the view of Schanz–Hosius 2^4. 835 and 863; cf. Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 143. (BML)

A13 Cornelius Bocchus

Peter 2. cxxiii–cxxv, 94–5; T. Mommsen, *C. Iulii Solini collectanea rerum memorabilium*[2] (Berlin 1895), x–xiv; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 646–7; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 148–9.

Pliny lists Cornelius Bocchus, in *nat.* 1, among his sources for books 16, 33, 34, and 37, and cites him four times on notable features of Spain, namely the juniper beams of the temple of Diana at Saguntum (*nat.* 16.216=Peter F4) and various mineral wonders (*nat.* 37.24, 97, 127=Peter F5–7). These citations probably come from a geographical or paradoxographical work concerned primarily or wholly with Spain. The author may be the L. Cornelius Bocchus attested on three inscriptions in his honour from Lusitania as *praefectus fabrum*, military tribune of the 3rd Legion Augusta and holder of priesthoods in his colony and for the province (*PIR*[2] C (1933), 1333).

Solinus cites a writer whom he names simply as Bocchus for the following items: the runner Polymestor of Miletus, a goatherd who won at the 46th Olympiad (596 BC) (1.97=Peter F2), the foundation of the southern Italian towns of Metaurus and Metapontum by respectively Zancle and Locri (2.11=Peter F3), and the claim that the Delphic Sibyl prophesied before the Trojan Wars and that Homer inserted many of her verses into his work (2.18=Peter F1). Whether Solinus and Pliny are citing the same author is uncertain, but it seems likely that they are quoting from different works. We can only speculate as to the character of the work used by Solinus. Mommsen conjectured that it was a chronographical work and one of Solinus' principal sources. This suggestion was accepted by Peter and was the basis for his inclusion of Bocchus in his collection, but it goes far beyond the available evidence. (JWR)

A14 Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, Cn.

Peter 2. cxvii, 91; id., *Gesch. Lit.* (1897), 1. 419; A. Stein, F. Skutsch, 'Cn. Cornelius (220) Lentulus', *RE* 4 (1901), 1384–6; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 554, 812, 818, 820; E. Groag, *PIR*[2] C (1933), 1390; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 126, 161; Syme, *AA* (1986), 298; A. A. Barrett, *Caligula: The Corruption of Power* (London, 1989), 101–6.

Gaetulicus, the consul of AD 26, was the commander of the Upper Rhine army for ten years, from 30 to 39, but met his death when accused of heading a conspiracy in 39 (Dio 59.22.5). He composed erotic verse (Plin. *epist.* 5.3.5; Martial, *praef.*) and an epic on an unknown subject, of which three lines concerned with the Britons are preserved by Probus (Virg. *georg.* 1.229). The only evidence for Gaetulicus as a historian is Suet. *Cal.* 8.1 (=Pliny 80 F3), where he is cited for locating the birth of Caligula at Tibur. Pliny regarded this as a flattering attempt to associate Caligula with Hercules, the patron god of Tibur. Despite Peter, Groag doubted this as evidence for a history. The flattering reference may well belong to the epic, which Barrett dates to 39. Syme, like Skutsch, envisaged a prose work, perhaps memoirs. (BML)

A15 Cornelius Scipio Africanus, P.

Peter 1^2. cxvii–cxviii, 44–6; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 232. See also Walbank, *Comm.* 2 (1967), 204; J. M. Candau in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 121–7.

The young P. Cornelius Scipio (the future Africanus) assumed command in Spain in late 210 BC, and in spring 209 surprised the Carthaginians by attacking and capturing their principal supply base, New Carthage. Polybius 10.6.10–9.1 sets out the calculations on which, in his view, Scipio decided on and planned the assault. He then (9.2–3) criticizes those who attributed his success to the gods and chance, arguing that this neglected probability, the testimony of Scipio's contemporaries, and 'the fact that in his letter to Philip Scipio himself explained clearly that it was on the basis of these considerations, which I have set out above, that he embarked on the operations in Spain overall and the siege of New Carthage in particular' (Pol. 10.9.3: *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς πρὸς Φίλιππον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἱοπλίου σαφῶς ἐκτεθεικότος ὅτι τούτοις τοῖς ἐκλογισμοῖς χρησάμενος, οἷς ἡμεῖς ἀνώτερον ἐξελογισάμεθα, καθόλου τε τοῖς ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλοιτο καὶ κατὰ μέρος τῇ τῆς Καρχηδόνος πολιορκίᾳ*).

Scipio probably wrote this letter to King Philip V of Macedon after their friendly encounter in 190, when the army commanded by Scipio's brother passed through Macedonia on the way to defeat Antiochus in Asia (Livy 37.7.15). The letter may have extended beyond the assault on New Carthage, e.g. to a general account of Scipio's Spanish campaign. Polybius presumably gained access to a copy in the Scipio family records through his friendship with Africanus' adoptive grandson Scipio Aemilianus. The letter does not seem to have gained wider circulation, since Cicero knew of no writings of Africanus (*off.* 3.4).

The letter's autobiographical character led Peter and Jacoby to include it, but we have decided to exclude letters, whether intended for publication or not (in this case we think not), from the present edition. (JWR)

A16 Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum, P.

Peter 1^2. cxix–cxx, 47–8; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 233. See also W. Soltau, 'P. Cornelius Scipio als Quelle Plutarchs', *Hermes* 31 (1896), 155–60; G. A. Lehmann, 'Die Endphase des Perseuskrieges im Augenzeugenbericht des P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica', in R. Stiehl, H. E. Stier (eds.), *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben. Festschrift F. Altheim* (Berlin, 1969), 387–412; Walbank, *Comm.* 3 (1979), 378–88; N. G. L. Hammond, F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, III: *336–167* BC (Oxford, 1988), 539–57; J. M. Candau in Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies* (2011), 129–32.

P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum, first cousin of Africanus, was curule aedile in 169 BC, and then served under L. Aemilius Paullus in his victorious campaign against Perseus in 168, probably as military tribune. Subsequently he was praetor in 165, elected consul in 162 but with the election subsequently annulled on technical

grounds, censor in 159, consul for 155, and Pontifex Maximus from 150. He died *c.*141. On his career see further Münzer, *RE* 4. 1497–1501.

At the start of Paullus' campaign in 168 Perseus was barring the way into Macedonia with a fortified position on the River Elpeus, but the Romans turned this by sending a force through the mountains under Nasica's command. The decisive victory at Pydna followed two days later, on 22 June. Only fragments survive of Polybius' account of the campaign. Livy's account follows Polybius (44.32.5–42.9), but is broken by several lacunae. Plutarch's account (*Aem.* 15–22) draws on three sources: Polybius, Posidonius, a contemporary Greek author of a history of Perseus (*FGrHist* 169), and Nasica himself, who gave an account in 'a short letter to one of the kings' (*Aem.* 15.4: *ἐπιστόλιον πρός τινα τῶν βασιλέων*). The addressee of Nasica's letter is unknown, but Masinissa is a likely candidate.

Plutarch evidently made extensive use of Nasica's letter. He cites it twice in his account of Nasica's march through the mountains, on the composition of Nasica's force and on his clash with Macedonian troops (at both points noting discrepancies with Polybius: *Aem.* 15.4–5, 16.3=Peter F1, Jacoby F1), and twice further in his account of the Pydna battle, on the Macedonian advance and the terrifying appearance of the Thracians at their head (*Aem.* 18.2–3=Jacoby F2), and on the Roman casualties (*Aem.* 21.3=Peter F2, Jacoby F3). Polybius too may have known the letter, but, if so, he showed a proper scepticism about Nasica's version, which was evidently self-dramatizing. On one point Nasica was clearly in error: Plutarch's claim (*Aem.* 16.2) that the Macedonian troops which Nasica encountered in the mountains had been sent by Perseus when he learnt of the Roman encircling force evidently derives from Nasica, but Polybius must have been right to say that Perseus had posted this garrison in his initial deployment (Livy 44.32.9).

Nasica's letter somehow entered circulation and so came to Plutarch's knowledge, although there is no reason to think that it was written for publication or as part of a formal history or autobiography. For this reason we have excluded it from this collection. (JWR)

A17 Cornelius Valerianus

Peter 2. ccviii, 159. See also Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 370–84; Schanz–Hosius 2[1] (1935), 784–5; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 140.

Pliny cites Cornelius Valerianus, in *nat.* 1, among his sources for books 8, 10, 14, and 15, and twice for specific pieces of information: for the appearance of the phoenix in AD 36 at *nat.* 10.5 (=Peter F1), and for a remarkable vine in the Porticus Liviae at *nat.* 14.11 (=Peter F2; this date for the appearance of the phoenix is also given by Dio 58.27.1. Tac. *ann.* 6.28 misdates it to AD 34). These two citations suggest that Cornelius Valerianus' work may have been a collection of marvels.

Münzer suggested that Sen. *breu. uit.* 13 and various passages in Pliny *nat.* 8 derive from this work, and that it aimed principally to identify the first Roman commanders to perform various achievements. Although accepted by Peter, this fanciful speculation is wholly unsubstantiated: see further L. Herrmann, *REA* 38 (1936), 177–81.

Pliny cites 'Valerianus' in *nat.* 1 as a source for book 3, and at *nat.* 3.108 for the Roman destruction of a town in Picenum belonging to the otherwise unknown Vidicini or Viticini. 'Valerianus' also appears at Arnob. 6.7 among a list of authorities for the story of the discovery of the head of Olus on the site of the Capitol. These references might suggest a work of historical character, but the author in question is likely to have been Valerius Antias (as is generally supposed), rather than Cornelius Valerianus. See further on Antias 25 F69–70.

Münzer's identification of our author with Q. Cornelius Valeri(a)nus, an equestrian officer honoured on an inscription from Castulo (*CIL* 2.3272), has won some support, but is entirely conjectural. On this individual see S. Demougin, *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens* (Rome, 1992), 357–61 (no. 436). (JWR)

A18 Deculo

Peter 2. ccviii, 159; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 400 f.; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 649 (bibl.), 827; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 178 f.

Pliny *nat.* 1 cites Deculo as a Latin source for books 10 (on birds; between Horace and Hyginus) and 35 (between Cornelius Nepos and Licinius Mucianus); *nat.* 35.70 (=Peter F1) concerns the value of a picture that Tiberius had in his bedroom. That might be from a book on works of art, a diatribe against extravagance, or, less plausibly, since the only other mention is in Pliny's book on birds, a biography of the emperor. Schanz–Hosius expressed scepticism about this man as a historian (649), probably rightly, and Bardon (*Litt. inconnue*, 2. 278) calls him an 'auteur de "compilations curieuses"'. Peter dates him to the reign of Tiberius, presumably because of his position in the list of Pliny *nat.* 10; but he may have written after it, as the subject of the excerpt suggests. (BML)

A19 Empylus

Peter 2. lxviii; Jacoby, *FGrHist* 191; Brzoska, 'Empylos', *RE* 5 (1905), 2543; Schanz–Hosius 1^4(1927), 395.

Empylos is mentioned by Plutarch (*Brut.* 2.4) as a rhetor who lived with Brutus, and as the author of a 'small but not insignificant' account of the murder of Caesar entitled simply 'Brutus'. Possibly identical with the Empylus of Rhodes mentioned by Cicero (*ap.* Quint. 10.64), he must count as a historian or author of memoirs, but as a Greek he cannot be considered a Roman writer and is therefore excluded. (TJC)

A20 Fabius, M.

Peter 2. clxxviiii–clxxx; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 374; A. Martin, 'La Préface de l'astronomie d'Hygin', *Latomus* 7 (1948), 209–11; A. Le Boeuffle, *Hygin: l'Astronomie* (Paris, 1983), xxxviii–xli.

The astronomical handbook (*De astronomia*) of Hyginus is dedicated to one M. Fabius, a student of *ars grammatica* who is commended 'not only for the measure of his verses . . . but also for the variety of his histories' (*non solum uersuum moderatione . . . sed historiarum quoque uarietate*). If the author of the *De astronomia* is to be identified with the imperial freedman C. Julius Hyginus (no. 63), as Le Boeuffle has argued, then Fabius can be dated to the Augustan period (Le Boeuffle, *Hygin: l'Astronomie*, xxxi–xxxviii, with discussion of possible identity of Fabius at xxxix–xli); others, however, date Hyginus to the second century AD (see introduction to Hyginus (no. 63), l. 476 and n. 15). However that may be, Fabius' status as poet and historian is seriously questionable (though accepted without demur by Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 161), since *uersus* may indicate 'lines of writing' rather than 'verses', and in the context of an astronomical work *historiae* probably means 'stories' or even 'subject matter' rather than 'histories' (thus Martin, *Latomus* 7 (1948), 209–11; Peter had already suspected as much). Hyginus himself regularly refers in this way to his own catasterisms—that is, mythological stories that explain the names of stars and constellations (e.g. 2.42 line 1337). (TJC)

A21 Fabius Gallus, M.

Peter 2. lx; Münzer, 'M. Fadius (6) Gallus', *RE* 6 (1909), 1958–9; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 280.

This individual used to be called M. Fadius Gallus, until Shackleton Bailey showed that the emended form Fadius (where the MSS always read Fabius) is wholly unjustified (*CR* 12 (1962), 195–6). A correspondent and friend of Cicero (*Att.* 8.12.1; 13.49.1; *fam.* 2.14; 7.23–25; 9.25.2–3; 13.59; 15.14.1–2), Fabius followed the latter's example in writing a work in praise of Cato. In a letter of August 45 Cicero asked him to send his *Cato* (*fam.* 7.24), and two days later implied that he had received it (7.25). Peter, who confessed serious doubts, suggested that it might have been a biographical memoir. But there is no particular reason to assume this, or to regard it, any more than any of the other *Catos* and *Anticatos* (by Brutus, Cicero, Hirtius, or Caesar himself), as deserving of inclusion in an edition of lost historical works. (CJS)

A22 Fabius Vestalis

Peter 2. ccvii–ccviii, 158–9; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 353–6; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 395; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 107–8.

Pliny *nat.* 1 cites Fabius Vestalis last as a Latin source for book 7 and books 34–6. Peter thought that Vestalis wrote like Fenestella (70), collecting Roman items and antiquities, and Münzer also places him in the intellectual context of the antiquarian Varro. However, his subject is a matter of dispute. At the end of the Latin sources for book 35 the MSS have '*Fabius Vestalis qui de pictura scripsit. externis . . .*'. This seems to differentiate him from Fabius Vestalis the antiquarian, referred to elsewhere in the indexes and cited in *nat.* 7.213 (so Peter). K. Mayhoff therefore emended the text to '*Fabio Vestali. EXTERNIS. Qui de pictura scripserunt*', which Bardon described as 'inutile'. Perhaps '*qui de pictura scripsit*' represents Pliny's way of identifying the particular work of Fabius that he used in 35 and/or of highlighting an obscure work which his readers were not likely to know. But there is no evidence that any of Vestalis' works was historical as opposed to antiquarian (so Schanz–Hosius, 395). (BMI.)

A23 Gellius, Sex.

Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 198; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 162; D'Anna, *OGR* 112–13; Suerbaum in Herzog–Schmidt 1 (2002), 429.

Sex. Gellius is cited once in *OGR* (16.4), together with 'Gaius Caesar' (see A24 L. Julius Caesar). Sex. Gellius is otherwise completely unknown, and the only positive grounds for supposing that there was a historian of this name is that DH 1.7.3 and Cic. *div.* 1.55 speak of 'Gellii', in the plural, in lists of Roman historians; but on this see introduction to Cn. Gellius (no. 14), I. 253. The alternative is to emend Sex. Gellius to Cn. Gellius, and to assume that the *OGR* was referring to the known annalist (no. 14). Momigliano suggested (*Secondo contributo*, 167) that the ultimate source cited 'Gellius and Caesar', without specifying their *praenomina*, and that the author of the *OGR*, or some other interpolator, arbitrarily supplied Sextus and Gaius respectively, where in fact Gnaeus and Lucius were meant. This economical solution seems the most likely to us, and we have therefore included the citation as a fragment of Cn. Gellius (14 F19), and relegated 'Sex. Gellius' to this appendix. (CJS)

A24 Julius Caesar, L.

G. Puccioni, 'La tradizione annalistica nell'Origo gentis Romanae', *AATC* 24 (1959–60), 223–99, esp. 231–45; E. Bickel, 'L. Caesar cos. 64 in der *Origo Gentis Romanae*', *RhM* 100 (1957), 201–36; P. L. Schmidt, 'Das Corpus Aurelianum und S. Aurelius Victor', *RE* Suppl. 15 (1978), 1583–1676, esp. 1607, 1621–2; Richard, *OGR* (1983), 139; D'Anna, *OGR* (1992), 88–9.

The *OGR* cites C. Caesar once (16.4), L. Caesar twice (14.5, 18.5), and 'Caesar' six times (9.6, 10.4, 11.3, 15.5, 17.3, 20.3). The likelihood is that all these citations refer to one and the same person ('C. Caesar' at 16.4 being a mistake: see above on Sex. Gellius, A23, and comm. on Cn. Gellius 14 F19), in which case he would be the most frequently quoted author in the whole work. Most scholars agree that he is L. Julius Caesar, a cousin of the dictator and the consul of 64 BC, who is known to have written a number of scholarly works, including *libri pontificales* and *libri auspiciorum* (Macr. 1.16.29; cf. Prisc. *GL* 2.270, Fest. 154; see Münzer, *RE* 10. 471, Richard 38–9; see also commentary on Gellius 14 F19), which encourages the identification with Caesar the author of *pontificalia* cited at *OGR* 9.6. But as all the quotations could derive from this and/or other antiquarian works, and as no history is known, it follows that L. Caesar should not be included in this edition. (TJC)

A25 Julius Secundus

Peter 2. clxx–clxxi; A. Gudeman, *Corneli Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus* (2nd edn. Leipzig and Berlin, 1914), 70–1; B. Gerth, 'Iulius (470) Secundus', *RE* 10 (1917), 800–803; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 199–200; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 800; L. Petersen, *PIR*^{2} (1966), I 559.

Julius Secundus, nephew and pupil of Julius Florus, the leading orator of the Gallic provinces (Quint. *inst.* 10.3.12–13; *PIR*^{2} I 317), and perhaps a connection of C. Julius Secundus, praetor at Burdigala (Bordeaux) among the Bituriges (*CIL* 13.596, with Syme, *Tacitus*, 800, and Tac. *dial.* 10.2), was a friend and contemporary of Quintilian (born AD 35) and a friend and teacher of Tacitus (*dial.* 2.1–2, with Syme, *Tacitus*, 177). He is one of the characters in the *Dialogus*. Lauded by Quintilian as an orator after his premature death (*inst.* 10.3.12–13; 10.1.120), he must have died some considerable time before the publication of the *Institutio*. He was probably of equestrian rank, and if he is rightly identified with the *rhetor* of Plut. *Otho* 9.2 (see below), he was Otho's correspondence secretary (*ab epistulis*).

Secundus is attested as the biographer of his great predecessor among the Gallic orators, Julius Africanus, in a passage implying that the life of an orator was a novelty (Tac. *dial.* 14.4). This was hardly a political biography (Africanus may not even have been a senator), and may have concentrated purely on oratorical matters; we have therefore decided, on balance, to exclude it from this edition.

It is usually agreed that this Secundus is the same man as ὁ ῥήτωρ (that is, the well-known orator), the narrator, to Plutarch or his source, of emperor Otho's last hours in 69 (Plut. *Otho* 9.2). In Gudeman's view (*Corneli Taciti Dialogus*, 70–1),

Secundus published an extensive work on the events of 69, comparable to that of Vipstanus Messalla (no. 86), while Bardon inclines to a memoir on the life of Otho (*Litt. inconnue*, 2. 200), similar, we might suppose, to the work of (e.g.) Volumnius (no. 47). On the other hand, Plutarch may not be referring to a written work at all, but rather to an oral anecdote. That the reference is to an oral report is strongly indicated by Plutarch's use of the imperfect διηγεῖτο ('used to relate'); thus R. Flacelière, E. Chambry, *Plutarque, Vies* 15 (Paris, 1979), 146. (BML)

A26 Junius Brutus, M.

Peter 2. lxvi–lxvii, 51; Schanz–Hosius 1[4] (1927), 394–7; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 250, 269.

Brutus the conspirator (85–43 BC) had broad intellectual interests, particularly in Stoic philosophy; he produced a number of works in his own name, as well as featuring in Cicero's correspondence and in some of his dialogues. His output included funeral speeches for his father-in-law Appius Claudius Pulcher (*GL* 1.367) and Cato the Younger (Cic. *Att.* 13.46.2; 12.21.1), which would have contained material of use to historians. But he is not known to have written any historical works of his own, and his efforts in this field appear to be confined to epitomes of others (see also Ateius Philologus (no. 51)). Plutarch tells us that he ignored his own exhaustion, the heat, and the tension of the moment to spend the day before the battle of Pharsalus writing an epitome of Polybius (Plut. *Brut.* 4.8; cf *Suda* s.v. *Βροῦτος*); and Cicero refers to his epitomes of Fannius (*Att.* 12.5b.3=Fannius 12 T4) and Coelius Antipater (*Att.* 13.8=Coelius 15 T4). But in the absence of other evidence, we see no justification for including Brutus as a historian in his own right. (CJS)

A27 Licinius Mucianus, C.

Peter 2. cxxxx–cxxxxii, 101–7; A. Kappelmacher, 'C. Licinius (116a) Mucianus', *RE* 13. 1 (1926), 436–43; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 608, 785 f.; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 179–83; *PIR*[2] L (1970), 216; R. Ash in E. Bispham, G. Rowe, E. Matthews (eds.), *Pliny the Elder* (London, 2007), 1–17.

A pair of works by Vespasian's right-hand man, governor of Syria 67–9 (cos. III 72), dead by the time Pliny wrote *nat.* 32.62, is mentioned: Tac. *dial.* 37.2 shows Mucianus collecting writings—*acta* and *epistulae*: Peter thinks the *acta* may have been created for Vespasian after the destruction of the Capitol, but Tacitus gives no suggestion of divergent inspiration. Second, thirty-two citations, taken to be fragments of another work, are collected by Peter from the elder Pliny, who also gives eighteen citations in his book 1 lists of authors, 2–13, 16, 19, 31, 33, 35, 36. The work is usually thought to post-date Mucianus' third consulship, but a date just before before 62–3, after the Lycian governorship, has also been proposed; one factor, unreliable given that we have only Pliny's selection, is the quantity of Lycian as opposed to Syrian material (see Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 182).

Although the passages are never referred to as part of a historical work, nor does Pliny mention Mucianus' achievements, and nothing in Tacitus' account of 69 seems to derive from him, Peter decided not to exclude Mucianus. In favour of *commentarii* is his rivalry with Vespasian and Corbulo (Tac. *hist.* 2.5.; 3.53; Suet. *Vesp.* 6), and the facts that they wrote *commentarii*, and that Pliny drew on Corbulo's *res gestae* and juxtaposed him and Mucianus in the source lists of books 5 and 6 (see Cn. Domitius Corbulo 84 T3, F3). That is flimsy. If Mucianus did write history, the subject matter is problematical. Parthian war, specifically a revision of Corbulo's account, is possible (cf. Pliny *nat.* 5.83). One particular reason for revision was what Corbulo wrote about Vespasian's kinsman L. Caesennius Paetus, who had failed in Armenia. Another option was Mucianus' own expeditionary force into Italy, rewarded with the *ornamenta triumphalia*. But that risked eclipsing Vespasian himself. If Mucianus, no weakling, went ahead, what we hear must be skewed by Plinian censorship.

The problem remains: surviving fragments do not fit the type of work (campaigns in Armenia) that Peter envisages; only two (4.77; 5.83) suggest knowledge of Armenia. Many are associated with places in Italy and the provinces. If they are part of a *chorographia* or a *periegesis*, as scholars have held (see Bardon, *Litt. inconnue*, 2. 181), it is a wide-ranging one. Kappelmacher regards the passages simply as a collection of marvels, *admiranda*; certainly the word *miraculum* occurs (*nat.* 8.6; 12.9). The material could be divided not geographically (overweighting Lycia) but by subject matter: geography and natural phenomena, plants and their products, animals, especially fish, human beings (Ash has a similar scheme).

Mucianus' weight as a politician should not tell against accepting him as a collector of curiosities. He was a notorious exquisite (Tac. *hist.* 1.10.2; Suet. *Vesp.* 13 at F 29). As Ash remarks, trivial subject matter could have been exquisitely expressed, though Pliny's presentation is unlikely to reveal that. (BMI.)

A28 Maecenas, C.

Peter 2. lxxvi–lxxvii; A. Kappelmacher, 'C. Maecenas (6)', *RE* 14 (1928), 218–29; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 17–21; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 13–19; S. N. Byrne, 'Horace, *Carm.* 2.12, Maecenas, and prose history', *Antichthon* 34 (2000), 18–29.

C. Maecenas, Augustus' close friend and adviser, wrote a number of works in verse and prose (listed conveniently by Schanz–Hosius 2[4]. 20–1). But there is only the most tenuous evidence that these included a history in prose. Servius (*georg.* 2.41) tells us that he wrote verses about Augustus' achievements (*Augusti Caesaris gesta*), citing Horace *carm.* 2.12.10 as his authority. But the latter text refers only implicitly to a historical poem (if at all), and its further suggestion that Maecenas should also write a history in prose cannot be taken to indicate that he actually did (cf. Nisbet and Hubbard ad loc.). Pliny drew upon Maecenas, together with Agrippa, for details of Octavian's illness at Philippi (*nat.* 7.148=Agrippa 59 F1), but this could come from any number of genres. The same is true of the story (set in the reign of Augustus) of a dolphin that fell in love with a boy (Plin. *nat.* 9.25), and of the prose fragments quoted in Sen. *epist.* 114.5; and the fact that Maecenas is listed by Pliny,

nat. 1, as a source for books 32 and 37 proves nothing (thus, rightly, R.G. Lewis, *ANRW* 2.34.1, 690 n. 198). (CJS)

A29 Octavius Musa

Peter 2. lxxxxviii–lxxxxviiii; W. Kroll, 'Octavius (73) Musa', *RE* 17 (1937), 1851–2; Schanz–Hosius 2⁴ (1935), 329; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 92.

Octavius Musa is known from the scholia on Virgil's *Eclogues* as a man who lost his herds in the confiscations but was subsequently compensated by Augustus (Serv. (DS) *ecl.* 9.7; Schol. Bern. *ecl.* 8.6). His connection with historiography rests solely on the *Catalepton*. Poem 4 is addressed to Musa as a learned man who is compared favourably to Clio, the Muse of History (*Clio tam certe candida non loquitur*: 'Fair Clio speaks not so truly'), though what precisely this implies beyond a play on the *cognomen* Musa is anyone's guess. He is presumably also the same person as the Octavius whose death (real or metaphorical) is lamented in poem 11, where the words *et te raptum et Romanam flebimus historiam* ('we shall weep for you, snatched from us, and for your Roman history') clearly imply that the history was never written, and that the lament was for both Octavius and his work. In any case it is not clear if the work was to have been in prose or verse. The uncertainty is aggravated by the generally unreliable nature of the *Catalepton* (cf. Horsfall in N. Horsfall (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, 1995), 11). Whether he is to be identified with the *optimus Octavius* who appears in Horace, *serm.* 1.10.82, in the company of Virgil, Maecenas, and friends, or with the M. Octavius cited by *OGR* 12.2 and 19.5 (no. 107), are matters of conjecture. (CJS)

A30 Pescennius Festus

Peter 2. ccvii–ccviii, 159; P. v. Rohden, H. Dessau, *PIR* 3 (1898), P 181; W. Kroll, 'Pescennius (1) Festus', *RE* 19 (1937), 1086; P. M. M. Leunissen, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander* (Amsterdam, 1989), 400 f.; K. Wachtel, *PIR*² (1998), P 249 f.

Peter was uncertain whether to include this author. He is known only from a passage on child sacrifice at Carthage (Lactantius *inst.* 1.21.13) attributed to his *historiae per saturam* (a translation of ποικίλη ἱστορία, according to Kroll). The subject could come from a history but is sensational and might belong to a miscellany of curiosities (*historiae* as 'stories'). Festus was tentatively identified by P. v. Rohden with an aristocrat killed in 197 by Septimius Severus (*HA* [Spart.] *Sept. Sev.* 13.1 and 6; *PIR* 3 (1898), P, 180), presumably a connection of the pretender C. Pescennius Niger (*PIR* 3 (1898), P 185=*PIR*² P 254). The executed Pescennii are usually considered fictitious; see Wachtel, *PIR*² P 247–9, 251–2); Dio 76.8.4 has twenty-nine senators executed, but does not offer a list. Leunissen, however, warns against dismissing all those named. Wachtel has separate entries for the two, but is inclined to identify them. (BML)

A31 Plinius Caecilius Secundus, C.

Peter 2. clxxiii–clxxiiii; Schanz–Hosius 2^3 (1935) 656–79; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956) 207, 226–7; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 333–5; L. Vidman, *PIR*^{2} (1998), P 490, esp. p. 208.

Pliny the Younger, of Novum Comum, born AD 61 or 62, reached the consulship in September–October 100; his last post was the legateship in Bithynia-Pontus, 109–11 or 110–12, in which he died. In 105–6 Pliny was urged to write history by Cn. Octavius Titinius Capito (*epist.* 5.8.1 and 14) and by others, demonstrating that he had not yet tackled that genre; he ends by asking Capito for a subject. Although he had dealt with the fate of Domitian's victims and had attacked their accusers, it had been in published versions of speeches (*epist.* 9.13.1); his correspondent Quadratus had indeed asked him for an account in context. There is no evidence that he carried through Capito's proposal, or that he wrote anything historical that was more substantial than his 'biographie élogieuse' of Vestricius Cottius, son of Vestricius Spurinna (*epist.* 3.10.1, AD 100). (BML)

A32 Procilius, L.(?)

Peter 1. cccIxxiv–cccIxxv (the second page missing in the 1967 reprint), 313–14; Chassignet 3. lxxxii–lxxxiii, 157–8; Münzer, *Beiträge . . . Plinius* (1897), 165–6; Schanz–Hosius 1^4 (1927), 323–4; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 249; K. Ziegler, 'Procilius (2)', *RE* 33 (1957), 68–9; J. Linderski, 'Three trials in 54 BC', *Studi E. Volterra* 2 (Milan, 1971), 281–302, esp. 290–5; T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (Oxford, 1971), 254, no. 343.

The author Procilius, mentioned by Cicero in a letter of December 60 BC (*Att.* 2.2.2), is probably identical with the man of that name referred to in *Q.f.* 2.7.1 (15 May 56) and the one who was subsequently convicted for murder in 54 (*Att.* 4.15.4). The idea that the latter had been tribune of the plebs in 56 (Broughton, *MRR* 2. 209) is based on a misunderstanding of Cicero's text (L. R. Taylor, *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 19 n. 19; Broughton, *MRR* 3. 175; Linderski, *Studi Volterra* 2. 291–2). He may also be the L. Procilius who was a moneyer in 80 BC (Crawford, *RRC* 396), and possibly the banker Procilius recorded on a *tessera nummularia* of 59 BC (*ILLRP* 1034; cf. Crawford, l.c.), although this is less likely if Cicero's acquaintance was a senator, which is not certain (rightly, Linderski, *Studi Volterra* 2. 294–5; Wiseman was certainly wrong to hint that he could have been a senator by 80 BC: *New Men*, 254). Ps.-Asconius on 2 *Verr.* 1.50 p. 236 Stangl appears to refer to Procilius as a provincial quaestor or legate, presumably in the late 70s BC.

In the letter of 60 Cicero compares Procilius unfavourably with Dicaearchus, the pupil of Aristotle who wrote on philosophy, literature, and constitutions, but was most famous for a wide-ranging work on Greek culture, the *Βίος Ἑλλάδος* (the 'Life of Greece'), which was probably the model for Varro's *De uita populi Romani*. The fact that Cicero found Dicaearchus more instructive than Procilius does not necessarily provide any clue to the character of Procilius' work, and in any case cannot support

the idea that he was a historian; indeed Rawson deduces from this passage that his work was antiquarian in character (*JRS* 62 (1972), 34=*Roman Culture*, 60). Two fragments cited by Varro (*ling.* 5.148, 154) deal respectively with the name of the Lacus Curtius (see Piso, 9 F8; Lutatius, 32 F11) and the place in the Circus known as *ad Murciae* (S. B. Platner, T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1929), 348; J. H. Humphrey, *Roman Circuses* (London, 1988), 61, 95–7; F. Coarelli, *LTUR* 3. 289–90); and Pliny, who lists Procilius in *nat.* 1 among his sources for books 8, 12, and 13, tells us, in his discussion of elephants (*nat.* 8.4), that according to Procilius the team of elephants that drew Pompey's chariot in his African triumph in 81 BC was unable to pass through the gate (sc. the *Porta Triumphalis*). As Münzer pointed out, this is as likely to have occurred in a discussion of the gates of the city as in a narrative account of the event, and we are inclined to follow him in thinking that Procilius was more probably an antiquarian than a historian (*Beiträge*, 166; so too Schanz–Hosius 1^4. 323, and Rawson l.c.); Münzer's suggestion that the work was a *periegesis* of the city of Rome remains attractive. Although he is included by Peter and Chassignet, we have decided to relegate Procilius to this appendix in the absence of any positive evidence that he wrote history. (TJC)

A33 Sardus (and anon)

Peter 2. clxxv–clxxvi; P. Fabia, 'Les Oeuvres de Tacite réussirent-ils auprès des contemporains?', *Rev. Phil.* 9 (1895), 1–10; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 649, 827; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 203; Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 108; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966), 513; R. Syme, 'The dating of Pliny's last letters', *CQ* 35 (1985), 176–85 (=*RP* 4 (1988), 478–89); 'Correspondents of Pliny', *Historia* 34 (1985), 324–59, esp. 333–5 (=*RP* 5 (1988), 440–77, esp. 450–2).

Only Pliny mentions Sardus, in *epist.* 9.31 (AD 108–9), establishing a *floruit*; Syme, *CQ* 35 (1985), 183 n. 60, notes the Flavian C. Asconius C. f. Sardus, *quattuoruir* of Patavium, a connection of the scholar Asconius (see A7). Sardus' work has been taken for a history of Nerva's rule and Pliny's role in it, and has been unconvincingly identified with the history mentioned in Pliny *epist.* 9.27. Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 513, more plausibly regards Sardus' work as a treatise on oratory. That leaves the author of the historical work anonymous, but Fabia and Syme have seen a reference to Tac. *hist.* and its dealings with the Flavian period (implying that part of the work was in a finished state in 106–8); see Fabia, *Rev. Phil.* 9 (1895), 8–9; Syme, *Tacitus*, 120; *CQ* 35 (1985), 487; Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 509–10. Certainly Pliny predicts immortality for the history, as he had done for Tacitus in *epist.* 6.16.2 f., of 106–7. (BML)

A34 Saufeius, L.

Peter 2. xxviiii, 8; Münzer, 'Ein römischer Epikureer', *Rh. Mus.* 69 (1914), 625–9; id., 'L. Saufeius (5)', *RE* 2A (1921), 256–7; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1956), 207–9.

L. Saufeius, a Roman *eques* and friend of Cicero and Atticus, whose devotion to Epicurean philosophy led him to take up residence in Athens, had his properties in

Italy seized by the triumvirs but then restored through the efforts of Atticus (Nepos, *Atticus* 12.3). He is frequently mentioned in Cicero's letters over the whole period from 67 (*Att.* 1.3.1) to 44 BC, and is represented, indeed sometimes caricatured, as a typical Epicurean (e.g. *Att.* 2.8.1; 4.6.1; 7.2.4; 15.4.2 with Shackleton Bailey's note ad. loc.).

The only preserved fragment (Peter F1, quoted by Servius (DS) on *Aen.* 1.6) concerns the etymology of Latium, so-called because the inhabitants had lain hidden there (*quod ibi latuerant incolae*). Other authors also derived the name Latium from the Latin verb *latere* ('hide'), but usually in the context of Saturn hiding there from Jupiter (R. Maltby, *Lexicon of Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), 329). Saufeius, by contrast, offers a unique rationalizing explanation that dispenses with divine myth and explains the name in terms of a vision of Latium's early inhabitants that strongly recalls Lucretius' account of primitive man in *DRN* 5.953 ff. This makes the identification with L. Saufeius, Cicero's wealthy Epicurean friend, extremely probable. Cic. *Att.* 1.3.1 perhaps implies that Saufeius was given to the ready production of philosophical tracts (cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.8.1 with Shackleton Bailey ad loc.), and Münzer supposed that Servius here draws on a digression in such a work. Other possibilities might be entertained and a historical work (as, by implication, Peter) cannot be entirely excluded: Saufeius' contemporary Diodorus brings comparable philosophical material into his world history (1.8.1–9), and Sallust (*Cat.* 6.1; cf. *hist.* 1.18M) alludes to a similar conception of the original inhabitants of early Latium that might owe more to popular contemporary ideas (and even specifically Saufeius) than to Cato (cf. comm. on Cato 5 F63 for further discussion and bibliography). However, Saufeius' known interests make attribution of our fragment to a philosophical (or even antiquarian) work more likely. That he wrote in prose is probable in view of the Ciceronian evidence but cannot strictly be proven. (AD)

A35 Scribonius Curio, C.

R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog. Eine literarischer Versuch* (Leipzig 1895), 1. 455–7; F. Münzer, 'C. Scribonius (10) Curio', *RE* 2A (1923), 8862–7; Schanz–Hosius 2[4] (1935), 351, 397, 616, 445; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 282–6, 288, 317.

C. Scribonius Curio the elder (cos. 76 BC), who is cited by Pliny *nat.* 1 among the sources for book 3, was an opponent of Caesar who died in 53. A written work is mentioned by Cicero (*Brut.* 218–19), in which Curio had presented himself as engaged in a dialogue with his son and C. Vibius Pansa (cos. 43) as they left a meeting of the senate that had been convoked by the consul Caesar. But the conversation also included an invective against Caesar's actions in Gaul in the years after his consulship. According to Cicero the anachronism was compounded by Curio's claim, in the same alleged exchange, that he had never attended the senate during Caesar's consulship! Some regard the reported dialogue as the opening section of an invective against Caesar, or of a historical account, and argue that it was the source of scurrilous items in Suetonius' biography: Münzer lists 9.2–3; 49.1; 50.1; 52.3. But in these passages Suetonius clearly refers to either speeches or oral attacks by Curio. There is no

evidence that Suetonius used the dialogue (if that is what it was) and no reason to treat any passages as fragments of a history by Curio. (CJS)

A36 Servilius (or Cornelius) Tuscus

Peter 2. cxvi–cxvii; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 381–2; R. Güngerich, 'Tuscus (2)', *RE* 7A (1948), 1492–3.

Tuscus is called *historicus fatuus* in Sen. *suas.* 2. 22, where in declaiming on the question of whether the Spartans at Thermopylae should stay or retreat he anachronistically cited Julius Caesar's famous slogan *ueni, uidi, uici*—actually used after the battle of Zela in 47 BC. In AD 34 Tuscus accused Mam. Aemilius Scaurus (cos. suff. 21), of *maiestas* (Tac. *ann.* 6.29.3–30.1). Tacitus refers to Scaurus' accusers as Servilius and Cornelius; one of them must have been Tuscus. No work is known. Peter suggested that *historicum fatuum* may refer to the actual saying, the 'historical ineptitude' that induced the declaimer to make his anachronistic point. Güngerich, sharing Peter's doubts, convincingly suggested that Seneca called Tuscus a historian ironically because of his anachronism; in the preceding section Cordus is pilloried for rhetorical fatuity. (BML)

A37 Tullius Cicero, Q.

Peter 2. xvii; F. Buecheler, *Quinti Ciceronis Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1869); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1 (1952), 249, 328, 333–4.

Q. Cicero, Marcus' younger brother, was praetor in 62 BC, and thereafter governed Asia (61–58), and held legateships under Pompey, Caesar, and his brother. In the civil war he took Pompey's part, but made his peace with Caesar after Pharsalus. His sympathies with Caesar's assassins ensured his proscription and death in 43. No great orator (as he ruefully acknowledged: Cic. *de orat.* 2.10), Quintus excelled in poetry, where Marcus professedly conceded his superiority (Cic. *Q.f.* 3.1.11; 4.4; cf. Courtney, *FLP* 179–181).

Whilst governing Asia, Q. Cicero asked his brother to correct and publish 'Annals' that he had written (Cic. *Att.* 2.16.4 (59 BC)). These should not be seen as the first part of the 'history' that Marcus, in response to Quintus' enquiry, encouraged him to write whilst he was in Gaul (so Peter): Cicero's language in *Q.f.* 2.12.4 (54 BC) implies that this would be a new venture (never fulfilled so far as we know). That in turn suggests that Quintus' *Annals* were not a prose history but in verse. If Quintus wrote in Latin, that supposition is further supported by the discussion between Atticus, Quintus, and Marcus about the defects of existing prose Roman historiography in *leg.* 1.6–8 (=GT 2): the absence there of any reference to Quintus' own Annals would be singularly tactless if these were a prose work. It may also be the Annals that lie behind the description of Quintus in Schol. Bob. 175 St. as a writer of epic, a genre in which he is not otherwise known to have composed (cf. Courtney, *FLP* 181). (AD/JWR)

A38 Valens

Peter 2. ccx, 161; R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (1971), index.

Peter admitted that nothing was known of this writer apart from the passage in John Lydus, *de mens.* 4.102, p.142W, unless he were identical with Statius Valens, cited in *HA Sev. Alex.* 48.6 alongside Fabius Marcellinus and Aurelius Verus as a source for a whole 'life' of Trajan; but it would be unwise to trust this biography for reliable information. All three authors are presented as fictions within quotation marks by Syme. John the Lydian cites Valens for the meaning of the name 'Caesar' (='long-haired'). The title of the work, *τὰ Καίσαρος*, may have been *Historia Caesaris*; so Peter, but not too much reliance should be placed on the wording of John the Lydian, and Valens' status as a historian or biographer remains shaky at best. There is no telling if he wrote in Greek or Latin. (BML)

A39 Verrius Flaccus, M.

Peter 2. cviii–cviiii, 78–9; M. E. Egger, *M. Verrii Flacci Fragmenta denuo collecta* (Paris, 1838); C. Müller (ed.), *Festus* (Leipzig, 1839), xiii; G. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907; repr. 1969), 1. 509–23; Schanz–Hosius 2^4 (1935), 361–7 (bibl.); Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 2 (1956), 110; and see General Introduction, I. 67–8.

Flaccus, a *libertinus* flourishing according to Eusebius–Jerome in AD 8, taught Augustus' grandsons (Suet. *gram.* 17). His works covered a wide range, literary, philological, and antiquarian, though they certainly included historical material (see e.g. *Annales Maximi* F 5). They included *De obscuris Catonis* ('Problematical Passages in Cato'), *Libri de orthographia* ('Volumes on Correctness in Writing'), *Epistulae*, and the *De uerborum significatu* ('On the Meaning of Words'). Verrius' *Etruscarum* (sc. *rerum*) *libri* ('Volumes on Etruscan Subjects') were probably an antiquarian work, like the *Saturnus*. The *Libri rerum memoriae dignarum* ('Volumes on Matters Deserving of Record') are of uncertain content but seem to be on the same lines as Varro's *Antiquitates* or Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*. Verrius' chief claim to fame in the historical field, although that too does not qualify as a work of history, is his edition of the *Fasti* of Praeneste, surviving in part (A. Degrassi (ed.), *Inscr. Italiae* 13. 2 (Rome, 1963), 107–45). (BML)

APPENDIX 2

OTHERWISE UNKNOWN HISTORIANS AND BIOGRAPHERS CITED IN THE *HISTORIA AUGUSTA*

Some thirty-six otherwise unknown historians and biographers are cited in the *Historia Augusta*. Although Peter included them in his collection, we share the view of modern scholars that they are probably fictitious, and have accordingly felt that no useful purpose would be served by including them in this edition. Rather than reproducing the relevant passages in full as testimonia and fragments, we list here the references, so that they can be consulted directly in the text of the *HA*. See further I. 78.

Acholius	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 14.6; 48.7; 64.5; [Vopisc.] *Aur.* 12.4
Aelius Maurus	[Spart.] *Sev.* 20.1
Aelius Sabinus	[Capit.] *Maximin.* 32.1
Aemilius Parthenianus	[Gallic.] *Avid.* 5.1
Arellius Fuscus	[Pollio] *tyr. trig.* 25.2
Asclepiodotus	[Vopisc.] *Aur.* 44.2
Aurelius Festivus	[Vopisc.] *quadr. tyr.* 6.2
Aurelius Philippus	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 3.2
Aurelius Verus	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 48.7
Caelestinus	[Pollio] *Val.* 8.1
Callicrates of Tyre	[Vopisc.] *Aur.* 4.2
Claudius Eusthenius	[Vopisc.] *Car.* 17.7
Cornelius Capitolinus	[Pollio] *tyr. trig.* 15.8
Curius Fortunatianus	[Capit.] *Max. Balb.* 4.5
Encolpius	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 17.1; 48.7
Fabius Ceryllianus	[Vopisc.] *Car.* 4.3
Fabius Marcellinus	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 48.6; [Vopisc.] *Prob.* 2.7
Fulvius Asprianus	[Vopisc.] *Car.* 17.7
Gallus Antipater	[Pollio] *Claud.* 5.4
Gargilius Martialis	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 37.9; [Vopisc.] *Prob.* 2.7
Julius Atherianus	[Pollio] *tyr. trig.* 6.5
Junius (or Aelius) Cordus	[Capit.] *Clod.* 5.10; 7.2; 11.2; *Macr.* 1.3; *Maximin.* 4.1; 6.8; 12.7; 27.7; 28.10; 29.10; 31.4; *Gord.* 4.6; 5.6; 12.1; 14.7; 17.3; 19.8; 21.3; 21.4; 22.2; 26.2; 31.6; 33.4; *Max. Balb.* 4.2; 4.5 (*bis*); 12.4
Lollius Urbicus	[Lampr.] *Diad.* 9.2
Maconius Astyanax	[Pollio] *tyr. trig.* 12.3
Nicomachus	[Vopisc.] *Aur.* 27.6
Onesimus	[Vopisc.] *quadr. tyr.* 13.1; 14.4; *Car.* 4.2; 7.3; 16.1; 17.6
Palfurius Sura	[Pollio] *Gall.* 18.6
Salvidienus, Marcus	[Vopisc.] *quadr. tyr.* 10.4

Septimius	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 48.7
Statius Valens	[Lampr.] *Alex.* 48.2
Suetonius Optatianus	[Vopisc.] *Tac.* 11.7
Tatius Cyrillus	[Capit.] *Maximin.* 1.2
Theoclius	[Vopisc.] *Aur.* 6.4
Turdulus Gallicanus	[Vopisc.] *Prob.* 2.2
Valerius Marcellinus	[Capit.] *Max. Balb.* 4.5
Vulcatius Terentianus	[Capit.] *Gord.* 31.5

APPENDIX 3

FROM RICCOBONI TO ROTH: EARLY EDITIONS OF THE FRAGMENTS OF THE ROMAN HISTORIANS

This appendix amplifies the brief remarks in the General Introduction (I. 4) on the editions of the fragments of the Roman historians which were produced from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries and were superseded by the work of Peter.

The first scholar to publish a collection of the fragments of the Roman historians was Antonio Riccoboni (1541–99).[1] Riccoboni was born at Rovigo, between the Adige and the Po, and after studies at Venice and Padua returned there to teach at the public school. Despite a brush with the Inquisition, Riccoboni secured appointment in 1571 as Professor of Greek and Roman Humanity at Padua, and held the position until his death. Although he later worked mainly on translating and commenting on various works of Aristotle, his first publications were a treatise on Cicero's rhetorical works (1567) and, in 1568, an essay on the writing of history accompanied by collections of the fragments of Cato, Claudius Quadrigarius, Sisenna, Sallust, and Varro, writers whom he had evidently chosen because of their especially numerous fragments.[2] The essay was one of a number of humanist treatises on what was known as the *ars historica*. A collection of such works was edited by Johann Wolf and published by Pietro Perna at Basel in 1576, and Riccoboni's essay was included in the second edition of this collection, published in 1579 under the overall title of *Artis historicae penus*.[3] Although it was the essay on history which earned him this republication, Riccoboni took the opportunity for substantial expansion of the accompanying collection of fragments, adding not only further fragments of Varro, but also fragments of twenty-two additional historical and antiquarian

[1] On Riccoboni's career and contribution to humanist studies see esp. B. Frischer, 'Horace and the end of Renaissance humanism in Italy', *Arethusa* 28 (1995), 265–88, and '*Rezeptionsgeschichte* and interpretation: the quarrel of Antonio Riccoboni and Nicolò Cologno about the structure of Horace's *Ars Poetica*', in H. Krasser and E. A. Schmidt (eds.), *Zeitgenosse Horaz: Der Dichter und seine Leser seit zwei Jahrtausenden* (Tübingen, 1996), 68–116 (we are grateful to Prof. Frischer for assistance). Riccoboni included autobiographical material in his *De gymnasio Patavino* (2nd edn. Padua, 1598), 28 ff., 53 ff., and other writings. There is some uncertainty about the correct form of his name: contemporaries used both 'Riccoboni' and 'Riccobono', as in the correspondence quoted in W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio: The Changing World of the Italian Renaissance* (Princeton, 1989), 328–44. Riccoboni's pioneering contribution to the collection of the Roman historical fragments has never been sufficiently acknowledged.

[2] *Antonii Riccoboni commentarius, quo per locorum collationem explicatur doctrina librorum de inventione, partitionum, topicorum, oratoris ad Brutum, librorum de oratore* (Venice, 1567); *Antonii Riccoboni Rhodigini de historia commentarius cum fragmentis ab eadem Antonio summa diligentia collectis M. Porcii Catonis Censoris, Q. Claudii Quadrigarii, L. Sisennae, C. Crispi Sallustii, M. Terentii Varronis et scholiis eiusdem Antonii in eadem fragmenta* (Venice, 1568).

[3] *Artis Historicae Penus. Octodecim scriptorum tam veterum quam recentiorum monumentis & inter eos Io. praepicue Bodini Methodi historicae sex instructa* (Basel, 1579). The *ars historica* treatises are brilliantly discussed by A. Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007); on Wolf's collection see esp. p. 125.

writers.[4] Riccoboni supplied some explanatory comments to accompany his fragments, but his collection of fragments for his chosen authors was very incomplete, in particular making little use of Greek sources and none of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and he often merely summarized his sources rather than quoting them verbatim.

In publishing a collection of fragments, Riccoboni was following the example first set by his teacher Carlo Sigonio and perhaps acting at his prompting. Sigonio (*c.*1522–84) was born at Modena, and held successively a lectureship at Venice (1552–60) and chairs at Padua (1560–3) and Bologna (1563–84). It was at Venice and Padua that he produced the greater part of his work on Roman antiquities, of which he was arguably the greatest Renaissance student, including a series of editions of the *Fasti*, a major edition of Livy, and the first two of the constitutional treatises eventually collected as eleven books *De antiquo iure populi Romani*.[5] Another of Sigonio's publications of this period was a collection of the fragments of Cicero, first issued in 1559.[6] The importance of this work has recently been brought out by Carlotta Dionisotti.[7] In earlier publications, fragments had merely been collected in miscellanies or included in extant authors' works. As Dionisotti observes, Sigonio's Cicero was the first publication consisting entirely of literary fragments preserved by citation, and it was surely his antiquarian interests that led him to the revolutionary new format. His example was rapidly followed: another edition of Cicero's fragments was produced by Sigonio's Polish pupil Andreas Patricius in 1561,[8] and in 1564 Estienne published the fragments of the Latin poets, with a dedication to Sigonio.[9]

As he himself tells us, Riccoboni attended Sigonio's lectures both in Venice and later at Padua, during Sigonio's brief and turbulent professorship there.[10] An incidental observation in the first edition of his collection of the fragments of the Roman historians confirms that he began work on the project before 1563 and with

[4] *Antonii Riccoboni Rhodigini de historia liber cum fragmentis historicorum veterum Latinorum summa fide ac diligentia ab eodem collectis et auctis* (Basel, 1579). Of Riccoboni's additional authors the following are included in our collection (listed in Riccoboni's ordering, but with our numeration): Fabius Pictor (1), Piso (9), Cassius Hemina (6), Cn. Gellius (14), Coelius Antipater (15), Fannius (12), Tubero (38), Sempronius Asellio (20), Valerius Antias (25), Cornelius Nepos (45), Sulla (22), Licinius Macer (27), Fenestella (70), Tuditanus (10), Cincius Alimentus (2), Oppius (40), Hyginus (63). Riccoboni also included the following antiquarian writers: Nigidius, Valerius Messalla, Ateius Capito, Masurius Sabinus, and Sammonicus Serenus. Like many later scholars, he confused the historian L. Cincius Alimentus with the later antiquarian L. Cincius (on this problem see the introduction to Cincius (2), I. 181–3).

[5] *Regum consulum dictatorum ac censorum Romanorum fasti* (Modena, 1550; subsequent editions in 1555, 1556, and 1559); *T. Liui historiarum ab urbe condita libri* (Venice, 1555; subsequent editions in 1566, 1572, and 1592); *De antiquo iure populi Romani libri XI* (Paris, 1576), of which the first parts, *De antiquo iure ciuium Romanorum libri II*, and *De antiquo iure Italiae libri III*, had originally appeared in separate editions in 1560. On Sigonio's career and significance, see McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*.

[6] *Fragmenta Ciceronis, varijs in locis dispersa, Caroli Sigonii diligentia collecta et scholijs illustrata* (Venice, 1559). A second edition soon followed (Venice, 1560). On the differences between the two editions, see McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, 296 n. 8.

[7] C. Dionisotti in G. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments* (Göttingen, 1997), 1–33. See also briefly Grafton, *What Was History?*, 80–1.

[8] *Fragmentorum M. Tullii Ciceronis tomi IIII cum Andreae Patricii adnotationibus* (Venice, 1561). A second edition with expanded commentary appeared in 1565. On Patricius (Andrzej Patrycy Nidecki), see McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, 296–7; Grafton, *What Was History?*, 125 ff.

[9] R. Estienne, *Fragmenta poetarum veterum Latinorum quorum opera non extant* (Geneva, 1564).

[10] Riccoboni, *De gymnasio Patavino*, 82', 'cui (*sc.* Sigonio) ego et Venetiis et Patavii operam dederam'; McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, 14, 18, 48.

Sigonio's knowledge: acknowledging that he had been pre-empted in publishing the fragments of Sallust's *Histories* by Aldus Manutius jr, who had included them in his edition of Sallust published in 1563, Riccoboni insisted that he was still justified in publishing his collection, since he had made it before Manutius' work appeared, 'as with very many others Sigonio can be a witness'.[11] It is therefore tempting to speculate that Riccoboni undertook the project at Sigonio's suggestion.[12] Sadly, their relations soured in later life. Riccoboni took the lead in exposing as spurious a work published in 1583 which purported to be Cicero's lost *Consolatio*. Sigonio had unwisely declared the work authentic, and the bitter controversy which ensued overshadowed the last year of his life. In the course of the dispute Riccoboni was able to produce the damning revelation that it was Sigonio himself who had supplied the text for publication.[13]

In 1595 a second collection of the fragments of the Roman historians appeared, compiled by Antonio Agustín and published after his death by Fulvio Orsini.[14] Agustín (1517–86) had spent the years 1544–64 at the papal court in Rome before returning to Spain to take up a bishopric, and during his stay at Rome he had, with Orsini and Onofrio Panvinio, formed part of a group of talented scholars making important contributions to the study of Roman epigraphy, laws, and antiquities.[15] Agustín's collection of the historical fragments was presumably compiled in this period, although only published posthumously some thirty years later. The work appears at any rate to have been made without knowledge of Riccoboni's editions. There are no explanatory notes, and the range of authors included is surprisingly limited (a mere twelve, omitting even Valerius Antias).[16] However, for the authors selected a more comprehensive range of fragments is given than by Riccoboni, with both Latin and Greek authors being quoted directly.

The next edition of the fragments of the Roman historians was produced by the Dutch scholar Ausonius van Popma (1563–1613).[17] This was published posthumously

[11] Riccoboni, *De historia commentarius . . .*(1568), 104': 'ut cum aliis plurimis testis esse Sigonius potest'. Manutius' edition: *C. Sallustii Crispi coniuratio Catilinae etc. . . . fragmenta eiusdem historiarum, e scriptoribus antiquis ab Aldo Manutio, Pauli f., collecta* (Venice, 1563). Earlier editions of Sallust included just the speeches and letters from the *Histories*.

[12] For Sigonio's support of his students' publications, see McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio* 69–71.

[13] See McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, 291–326.

[14] *Fragmenta historicorum collecta ab Antonio Augustino, emendata a Fulvio Vrsino* (Antwerp, 1595). The volume also contains notes on various extant Roman historians (occupying most of the book), which are attributed to Orsini but in fact incorporate without acknowledgement notes by Pedro Chacón and others, as is made clear by G. Jungermann in his edition of Caesar (Frankfurt, 1606), preface to the notes (no page no.). Chacón, who assisted Agustín's research in Rome, may have contributed to his work on the fragments. We are grateful to M. H. Crawford for information on these points.

[15] On Agustín and his associates see M. H. Crawford (ed.), *Antonio Agustín between Renaissance and Counter-Reformation* (London, 1993); J.-L. Ferrary, *Onofrio Panvinio et les antiquités romaines* (Rome, 1996); W. Stenhouse, *Reading Inscriptions and Writing Ancient History* (London, 2005).

[16] The included authors, in the volume's haphazard order but with our numeration, are: Fabius Pictor and other Fabii (1, 8), Licinius Macer (27), Sempronius Asellio (20), Coelius Antipater (15), Claudius Quadrigarius (24), Clodius Licinus and other Clodii (16, 64), C. Acilius (7), Cincius Alimentus (2), Cn. Gellius (14), Piso and other Pisones (9), Cassius Hemina (6), and Sisenna (26).

[17] Popma had previously edited the fragments of Varro (*Fragmenta M. Terentii Varronis: Satyrarum Menippearum. Logistoricorum. [Periplou philosophias], lib. II. Pronethei, lib. II. De philosophia, lib. I. Edente & recensente Ausonio Popma, frisio. Eiusdem Ausonii in eadem coniectanea* (Francker, 1589); second edition, *M. Terentii Varronis operum quae exstant, nova editio*, Leiden, 1601); and the fragments of Cato's *Origines*

in 1620, with additions and further notes by Johannes Isacius Pontanus (1571–1639).[18] Popma's edition represented a significant advance on its predecessors, with a fuller range of authors (thirty-seven in total), brief but helpful notes, and a relatively comprehensive selection of fragments.[19] Popma was the first editor to draw on the *Origo Gentis Romanae* as a source of fragments, and was able to include authors attested only in that work.[20] Like Riccoboni, however, he often resorts to summarizing, and he does not reproduce fragments from Greek authors in the original (though he does give Greek text on occasion). Popma explains his selection as including those who wrote the *annales* and *historiae* of the *res gestae* of the Roman people, and as excluding those who wrote autobiographies or biographies, or *commentarii* of Roman antiquities, such as Sulla, Oppius, Hyginus, Tuditanus, and the others whose remains were collected by Riccoboni.[21] Popma praises Agustín, but regards his work as including too few authors, just as he regards Riccoboni's as including too many. He claims that he himself has gathered into one place the fragments of all those who wrote the *res gestae* of the Roman People, except for those of Varro and Sallust, which he suggests are better studied in his own editions of those authors.[22] Popma's policy of excluding the antiquarians was followed by his successors, including Peter and ourselves (see further I. 8–9).

together with the *De agricultura* and fragments of other works: *M. Porci Catonis quae exstant* (Leiden, 1590), a second edition of which appeared in 1598 (*M. Porcii Catonis De agricultura, siue, De re rustica*, also published at Leiden), and a third in the same year as the *Fragmenta historicorum veterum Latinorum* (*M. Porci Catonis De re rustica liber*, Franeker, 1620). On Popma see *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 26 (Leipzig, 1888), 416–17.

[18] *Fragmenta historicorum veterum Latinorum, ab Ausonio Popma Frisio collecta, emendata et scholiis illustrata* (Amsterdam, 1620). The layout of the work is rather complex and sometimes leads to confusion. It begins with seven 'judgements' (*iudicia*) on the *veteres historici* from ancient authors (3–4), akin to our General Testimonia (indeed, they include our GT1, GT2, and GT4). There follow the fragments of Popma's thirty-seven authors (5–113), textual variants and conjectures (including Popma's own) added by Pontanus (114–17 ('127')), and Pontanus' *auctarium* of additional authors and fragments (118–28); Popma's own *scholia* to the fragments are at 129–81: these are preceded in later examples of the book by two leaves (their numbering a repeat of pp. 129–32), which contain omitted items (*paralipomena*) to be added to Popma's fragments (129–30) and to his *scholia* (130–2), and then further omitted items to be added to Pontanus' additional authors and fragments (132) and to his final supplement (132); finally, following Popma's *scholia*, come indexes of his thirty-seven authors and their archaic vocabulary and phraseology (181–5), Pontanus' final supplement (*observationum . . . mantissa*) (186 ('188')–93), and lists of *errata* and *omissa* (193), the latter of which, with one exception, are also to be found in the *auctarium*, the *paralipomena*, or both. The fragments of Sisenna had also been printed separately with Popma's posthumous edition of Sallust: *C. Sallustii Crispi opera quae exstant et L. Cornelii Sisennae historiarum fragmenta* (Franeker, 1619).

[19] The authors added to Agustín's selection, in Popma's order, are: P. Scipio (3), C. Fannius (12), Vennonius (13), Libo (36), M. Porcius Cato (5), A. Postumius Albinus (4), Sextus Gellius, 'Agellius' (see Sempronius Asellio 20 F3, comm.), Lutatius (32), Q. Aelius Tubero (38), P. Rutilius Rufus (21), Valerius Antias (25), C. Aufidius (17), Accius, M. Terentius Varro (52), Q. Hortensius Hortalus (31), Pomponius Atticus (33), Cornelius Nepos (45), Fenestella (70), Tanusius Geminus (44), Domitius (104), Egnatius (105), and M. Octavius (107). Of these, Fannius (12), Cato (5), Tubero (38), Valerius Antias (25), Varro (52), Cornelius Nepos (45), and Fenestella (70) had already appeared in Riccoboni's second edition.

[20] Thus Domitius (104), Egnatius (105), and M. Octavius (107).

[21] This passage (113), which at least purports to be in Popma's own words, closes the part of the book containing Popma's collection of fragments. By 'the others' he must mean Nigidius, Valerius Messalla, Ateius Capito, Masurius Sabinus, and Sammonicus Serenus.

[22] Popma did, however, include in his work the fragment of Varro's *Annales* which in this edition is Varro 52 F1. In respect of Cato, he includes fragments attributed to the *Origines* and the *De re militari*, but refers readers (31) to his own separate work (*De re rustica*) for the fragments of the speeches and other works of Cato.

Pontanus' additions to Popma's work included not only supplementary notes, but also an *auctarium* containing fragments of a further eighteen authors.[23] Many of these were from the triumviral and early imperial periods, represented in the earlier collections only by Hyginus and Fenestella (and, in Riccoboni's edition, by some antiquarian writers).

Beside these editions of the fragments, mention should be made of the remarkable study of Latin historians by another Dutch scholar, Gerardus Vossius (Gerrit Vos, 1577–1649), a work of considerable learning and acumen which, along with the same author's survey of Greek historians, was not superseded until the nineteenth century.[24] Vossius compiled information on all known Latin writers of history in verse and prose. The most notable feature is the attention given to lost works, which are listed exhaustively, thereby pointing the way for a future complete edition of the fragments. Almost all of the historians included by Peter, and in the present edition, are noticed, however briefly, in Vossius. He deals with the historians in chronological order, placing them in their historical context, citing the principal testimonia, and noting some fragments omitted from the published collections.

Although each individual edition, even Popma's, had its omissions, the Renaissance editors had collectively rounded up most of the republican authors and fragments, leaving relatively little for their successors to add. A characteristic feature of these editions is the way in which the fragments are arranged. In all of them the entry for each work of each historian opens with fragments assigned to specific books, and continues with fragments classified as 'uncertain' (*incerta*). For the fragments assigned to books, attempts were sometimes made to arrange them by chronological order of subject matter, but editors generally ordered the many *incerta* just by their citing source, and did not seek to reproduce the chronological structure of the original works.

Popma's work had great influence on subsequent editions of the fragments. Fourteen years later there appeared an edition of Sallust by Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn (1612–53) which included the fragments of the *veteres historici* at the end.[25] This was the first of many editions of Sallust to do so, a large proportion of which were clearly designed for use in schools and universities. Boxhorn's work itself appeared in various

[23] Pontanus' additional authors are: Asinius Pollio (56), C. Drusus (66), Cn. Lentulus Gaetulicus, Julius Marathus (65), Junius [*sic*] Saturninus (68), Actorius Naso (43), Eulogius, T. Ampius (34), Valerius Messalla (61), Cassius Severus, 'Pestanus Vibonensis', Hostius, Furius, Pescennius Festus, Augustus (60), C. Oppius (40), Masurius Sabinus, and Julius Hyginus (63). He also adds one additional fragment each of Cornelius Nepos (45) and Q. Tubero (38). Despite these additions, Pontanus still considered that he was excluding antiquarian writers and others whose works could not be called 'historical' (pp. 124–5). At the end of his *mantissa* (pp. 192–3), he refers also to one further historian, L. Lucceius (no. 30 in our edition).

[24] G. J. Vossius, *De historicis Latinis libri III* (Leiden, 1627), following his *De historicis Graecis libri IV* (Leiden, 1624); second, expanded, editions of both were published in 1651. The first volume of *De historicis Latinis* extends down to Justin; the remaining two volumes bring the coverage up to Vossius' own time, and he distinguishes between the historical writing of antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance. On Vossius see C. S. M. Rademaker, *The Life and Thought of G. J. Vossius* (Assen, 1981); N. J. Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius and the Humanist Conception of History* (Assen, 1993).

[25] *C. Sallustius Crispus, cum veterum historicorum fragmentis* (Leiden, 1634).

editions, and his presentation of the fragments was also used in other editions.[26] Boxhorn essentially maintains Popma's arrangement, adding brief introductions to each author which draw on Vossius' *De historicis Latinis* and incorporating all the additional fragments from Popma's *paralipomena* and *omissa*, with the exception of Tubero 38 F15.[27] Otherwise, there are only very minor changes to Popma's edition.[28] Boxhorn explains that he is adding Popma's collection of the fragments of the *veteres historici* to the edition of Sallust, the 'Prince of the Historians', in view of Sallust's passion not just for antiquity but also for antique language.[29] He does not include any of the additional authors identified by Pontanus.

The Cambridge scholar Joseph Wasse (1671–1738), whom Bentley is said to have judged the most learned man in England after himself, made more substantial changes to Popma's work in his 1710 edition of Sallust than had Boxhorn.[30] Wasse included fragments of the additional authors identified in Pontanus' *auctarium*, and reproduced Popma's *scholia* and Pontanus' *observationum . . . mantissa* as footnotes, which are interspersed with his own notes. He prints the texts of Greek authors in the original, and divides all the fragments of all the authors as a corpus into 151 numbered sections. For the fragments of Cato he introduced much material from Popma's separate treatment of him, explaining that it was Cato whom Sallust held in the highest regard.[31] Elsewhere he introduces new fragments (e.g. Piso 9 F9), but he also omits fragments (e.g. Tubero 38 F1 from Popma's *paralipomena*, which Boxhorn had included), and makes some strange decisions, such as adding Fabius Pictor 1 T3a as a fragment, taking Gellius 14 F12a from Cn. Gellius and making it a fragment of 'S. Gellius',[32] or placing Piso 9 F9 with the fragments of the 'historia de Gorgia Leontino' attributed to Cincius.

Although editions of the fragments which followed Boxhorn's arrangement appeared in editions of Sallust for approximately two hundred years, Wasse's example

[26] Thus it is used in the edition of Sallust printed by William Turner at Oxford in 1639; in that printed by Justus Livius at Leiden in 1645 and those published at Amsterdam under the name of Rutger Hermannides in 1661, 1666, and 1675; in the Venice edition printed by the heirs of Giunti and Baba (1649) and a number of those printed by Niccolò Pezzana and his heirs (including those of 1733 and 1775); in the edition produced by Samuel Grosser (Dresden and Leipzig, 1699); in the later versions (subsequent to the first of 1754) of the edition by the Jesuit Guido Ferrari, published explicitly as university or school texts (Venice, 1761; Bassano, 1776 and 1795); and in the editions printed by Giuseppe Molinari (Venice, 1825) and Pietro Aurelj (Rome, 1831).

[27] Boxhorn does not include Popma's equivalent of our General Testimonia, and he also cuts out the headings for P. Scipio and Aecius, since no fragments were attributed to them.

[28] The changes do, however, occasionally have consequences. By removing 'LICINII' from Popma's heading 'LICINII RERVM ROMANARVM LIB. XXI.', Boxhorn (268) changes the attribution of the fragment: Popma (63, 150, 181) thought that it was either a fragment of a different 'Licinius' (i.e. Clodius 'Licinius') from Licinius Macer, or one of Licinius Macer, while Boxhorn makes it a definite fragment of Licinius Macer. This divergence is reflected in later editions of the fragments, with Krause following the tradition that began with Boxhorn but Roth following Popma: see Licinius Macer 27 F32, comm.

[29] The Pezzana editions and the editions of Ferrari noted above, followed by the editions printed by Molinari and Aurelj, place the fragments of the *veteres historici* before, rather than after, the fragments of Sallust's *Historiae*.

[30] *C. Crispi Sallustii opera quae extant . . . Accedunt Julius Exsuperantius, Porcius Latro et fragmenta historicorum vett. cum notis A. Popmae. Recensuit, notas perpetuas & indices adjecit Josephus Wasse* (Cambridge, 1710). On Wasse see E. Marchant and P. Carter, at <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28808>.

[31] The fragments are at [2] pp. 169–282; for Wasse's justification for their inclusion, see pp. x–xi.

[32] Section CXXXVI on p. 269.

was followed in other editions of Sallust, namely those of Volpi (Padua, 1722), Kortte (Leipzig, 1724), Haverkamp (Amsterdam, 1742), Miller (Berlin, 1751), and Frotscher (Leipzig, 1825).[33] Of these editions, those of Volpi, Haverkamp, and Miller use Wasse's section numbers to divide up the fragments. Volpi expresses his admiration for Wasse's edition (while berating its misprints, especially in the fragments of the *veteres historici*). He includes brief introductions to each author which draw on Vossius and on Wasse's introductory footnotes (though he does not reproduce Wasse's other footnotes), and he took the trouble to consult editions of the various citing authors, providing a list of those which he used in improving the text of the fragments.[34] He had also clearly consulted Popma's work directly, restoring to Cn. Gellius, for example, Gellius 14 F12a, which had been moved by Wasse, and like Popma he gives renderings of Greek fragments into Latin (the versions he uses differing from Popma's). Kortte, by contrast, keeps close to Wasse's text, though eschewing both his footnotes and his section numbers. Haverkamp, like Volpi, followed Wasse but also consulted Popma's edition of the fragments directly. He restores Popma's seven passages of ancient 'judgements' on the *veteres historici*, and adds the section from the end of Riccoboni's essay on history which concerns the loss of so great a portion of the writings of the Roman historians and the importance of careful work on their fragments.[35] He sometimes adds to the footnotes (comprising his own notes and notes from Popma, Pontanus, and Wasse) *scholia* of Popma which Wasse had missed, such as the note on *qui tantisper* in Cato 5 F153.[36] Furthermore, he appends to his edition of the fragments an edition of Popma's two books *De usu antiquae locutionis*,[37] to illustrate above all the *veteres historici* and other ancient writers. His additions to Wasse's collection of the fragments are few, but include a fragment of Piso (9 F6) and fragments from various works of Cornelius Nepos.[38] Miller follows Haverkamp's edition closely, the most significant difference being the removal of 'Pestanus Vibonensis'.

Frotscher's edition of the fragments in his 1825 edition of Sallust in some ways marks a departure from previous practice. Frotscher reorganizes the fragments to a significant extent, complaining, as Volpi had done, about the lamentable lack of attention to detail in previous editions, and he numbers both the authors (of which he

[33] *C. Crispi Sallustii quae extant ex optimis codd. accuratissime castigata. Accedunt Julius Exsuperantius, Porcius Latro, et fragmenta historicorum veterum* (Padua, 1722); *Caii Crispi Sallusti quae exstant. Item . . . Iul. Exsuperantius de bellis ciuilibus et Porcius Latro in Catilinam recensuit diligentissime et adnotationibus illustrauit Gottl. Cortius. Accedunt fragmenta ueterum historicorum . . .* (Leipzig, 1724), [2] 1–76 (2nd edn. Venice, 1737); *C. Crispi Sallusti quae exstant. . . . Accedunt Iulius Exsuperantius et Porcius Latro ut et fragmenta historicorum, cum notis integris A. Popmae, Coleri, Ruperti, Wasse, Broukhusii etc. Cura Sigeberti Havercampi* (Amsterdam, 1742), 2. 247–396; *C. Crispi Sallustii quae exstant. Accedunt Iulius Exsuperantius Porcius Latro et historicorum veterum fragmenta curante Ioanne Petro Millero* (Berlin, 1751); *Caii Crispi Sallustii quae exstant . . . accurate edidit . . . Carolus Henricus Frotscher. Accedit . . . veterum historicorum fragmenta plenius et emendatius edita* (Leipzig, 1825), 355–508. The editions printed by Molinari and Aurelj, though firmly in the tradition which began with Boxhorn's edition, show traces of the tradition which began with Wasse's.

[34] His list of editions is at 435–41 (his comments on Wasse are in the introductory *epistola ad lectorem* and on 439–40).

[35] This appeared in Riccoboni's 1568 edition at 44^{v}–45^{r}, and in his 1579 edition at 78–80.

[36] Popma 7, 135; Wasse [2] p. 183; Haverkamp 2. 273.

[37] At 2. 409–523. These were originally published in 1606 (at Antwerp?).

[38] The fragments of Nepos are at 2. 381–4, incorporated into Wasse's section CXXXVIII.

lists 55) and their fragments.[39] Frotscher adds some new fragments, such as Piso 9 F48 (our numeration rather than Frotscher's, which would be XV F44), and corrects previous errors in attribution, such as that of Piso 9 F9, which had reposed quietly under the fragments of the 'historia de Gorgia Leontino' attributed to Cincius since Wasse's edition of 1710, remaining undisturbed through the editions of Volpi, Kortte, Haverkamp, and Miller for more than a century until Frotscher rescued and relocated it. Frotscher's edition was made particularly valuable when supplemented by his three-volume collection of commentaries on the works of Sallust, which included in the third volume commentaries on the fragments of the *veteres historici*.[40] In these commentaries, which helpfully bring together the notes of Popma, Pontanus, Wasse, and Haverkamp, together with some of Frotscher's own, Frotscher assists navigation by using Haverkamp's page numbers and Wasse's section numbers, while reproducing also his own author and fragment numbers.[41] Like Wasse, he had consulted Popma's separate edition of Cato (specifying the third edition of 1620), and in many respects he had been careful to make his work clear and useful to his readers.

The strong influence of the Renaissance editors on subsequent editions of the fragments is thus still evident well into the nineteenth century. However, by the early years of that century the new critical approach to the study of Roman history pioneered by Niebuhr had made a more analytical edition of the fragments desirable. It was a considerable time before this need was adequately met. A. Krause in 1833 produced an edition which acknowledged the new direction which Niebuhr had given to Roman historical studies as its inspiration.[42] This was the first 'free-standing' edition of the fragments since Popma. The work begins with a long introductory essay, and includes a prefatory essay on each author. Krause excludes the authors from Pontanus' *auctarium*, but includes individual entries with brief introductions for the poets Naevius, Ennius, and Accius ('L. Attius'), and the Greek authors Philinus, Silenus, the two Sosili, Chaereas, Timaeus, Zeno, Polybius, and Strato.[43] Krause slights Frotscher's work in his preface, but perhaps unfairly so:[44] though Krause introduces new fragments (e.g. Piso 9 F3) and provides many helpful references in his essays, his own work is rather haphazard and erratic in places.

The next edition, that of C. L. Roth in 1852, did mark a significant step forward. In appearance it is old-fashioned, since it is appended in the time-honoured way

[39] Frotscher's total was not arrived at simply by adding Pontanus' eighteen authors to Popma's thirty-seven. Of those included by Popma or Pontanus, three are not in Frotscher's edition (Licinius (63), Nepos (104, 119), and (following Miller) 'Pestanus Vibonensis' (121)), while he includes as separate authors 'Q. Tubero' (to whom is attributed Tubero 38 F15, which was treated by Pontanus as an additional fragment of Popma's Tubero rather than as a fragment of a separate author), 'Claudius' (who, Frotscher admits, will be Claudius Quadrigarius, the two fragments here being our Quadrigarius 24 T1/F58 and T2/F66), and 'Clodius', our Paulus Clodius (16).

[40] *Doctorum hominum commentaria in C. Sallustium Crispum post S. Havercampum denuo edidit Carolus Henricus Frotscher* (Leipzig, 1828–30). The commentaries on the fragments are at 3. 273–344.

[41] Frotscher prefaces the commentaries with the 'judgements' from Popma (omitting one – our Sisenna 26 T13=GT4), and the closing section of Riccoboni's introductory essay.

[42] A. Krause, *Vitae et fragmenta veterum historicorum Romanorum* (Berlin, 1833). Krause acknowledges Niebuhr on the first page of the preface.

[43] Excluding these, he itemizes a total of thirty-nine authors.

[44] Thus Krause remarks (75, 147) on how astonishing it was that Piso 9 F9 had been placed under the wrong author by previous editors, but he does not give Frotscher the credit for having seen this.

to an edition of Sallust, in this case by his Basel colleague Gerlach, and has Latin summaries of fragments from Greek sources, recalling the practice of Popma and Volpi.[45] Like Krause, Roth excluded the authors from Pontanus' *auctarium*. He added no notes (other than brief comments amid the fragments), but, as Peter remarks, he showed more critical judgement than Krause.[46] As in Frotscher's edition, both the authors and the individual fragments are numbered.[47] The preface to the volume as a whole explains that the addition of Roth's collection of the fragments to the works of Sallust makes the volume a modest corpus of all the remnants (*monumenta*) of ancient Roman history from Fabius Pictor to Livy.[48] Thus, with the last of the editions of Sallust to include the fragments of the *veteres historici*, the focus of attention has in a sense shifted from Sallust to Livy.

Roth's major innovation was in the ordering of the fragments. He for the first time attempted as far as possible to arrange the fragments in the order in which they would have appeared in the original work, taking account not just (like his predecessors) of book numbers, but also of the chronological order of events reported. In this respect his example was followed by Peter and his successors. This was a major advance. However, as was remarked above (I. 7), in their zeal to reconstruct the lost original, editors from Roth on have sometimes been too confident in their identifications of context, and in the present edition a somewhat more conservative policy has been followed.

The editions produced in the centuries before Peter had many shortcomings. Peter introduced a new standard of critical rigour and also collected for the first time the fragments of many of the post-republican historians. However, the pioneering editors also had important achievements to their credit. They had defined the lost Roman historians and biographers as a distinct corpus whose fragments deserved collection, and had carried out the hard work of identifying the fragments of the republican (and some of the later) historical writers.

(MPP, JWR)

[45] *Gai Salustii Crispi Catilina Iugurtha Historiarum reliquiae . . . edidit Fr. Dor. Gerlach. accedunt historicorum veterum Romanorum reliquiae a Car. Lud. Roth collectae et dispositae* (Berlin, 1852).

[46] For Peter's judgement of his predecessors see *HRR* 1 (1870), vii–viii.

[47] Thirty-nine author headings are included, from Fabius Pictor to 'Q. Aelius Tubero', and enumerated in sequence. The only subsequent edition to number the authors before our own is that of Beck and Walter.

[48] At p. xi.

APPENDIX 4

A NOTE ON DATES

With the introduction of a new calendar by Caesar in 45 BC, a system of dating was introduced which is still familiar today. There were 365 days in each year, except in every fourth year, when an extra day was intercalated in order to keep the calendar year synchronized with the seasonal year. Some readjustment of this calendar was necessary under Augustus because of inaccurate intercalation by the pontifices, and the calendar was adjusted again in accordance with Gregory XIII's reforms in 1582. But the use of Caesar's calendar—the 'Julian' calendar—allows us to understand the passage of time in ancient history in relation to our own calendar.

According to the Julian calendar, AD 8, AD 4, 1 BC, 5 BC, etc. are treated as leap years (whether the actual Roman calendar years corresponding to these Julian years in this period of adjustment contained the extra day or not): so too, therefore, Julian year 37 BC, 41 BC, 45 BC, and (working backwards through the period before Caesar's calendar was instituted—i.e. using 'retrojected' Julian years) 49 BC, 53 BC, etc., each contain 366 days, with the years in between containing 365 days. Thus by '753 BC' we mean a specific sequence of 366 days, stretching from a point shortly after one midwinter to approximately the same point after the next, which we can relate directly to our own calendar in terms of its length, the season at which it began and ended, and its distance in time from the present. When we say that Varro placed the foundation of Rome in 753 BC, we mean that he assigned it to a point within that particular sequence of 366 days.[1]

On occasion in the republican period it is possible to give a Julian calendar date for an event (such as the dates of eclipses given in *Annales Maximi* F5, comm.), but this is usually not the case. In those circumstances, we need to date by the years recognized by the Romans, either by the calendar year (which, at least in the later history of the republic and perhaps from the outset, ran from the first day of the Roman month of January to the last day of the Roman month of December), or, more commonly, by the consular year, which ran from the day the consuls entered office until the day they demitted from office. It was only from 153 BC that the consuls entered office on the first day of the Roman month of January and consular years matched calendar years: until then the consuls entered office on another day—which had in the recent past been most commonly the 15th day (the Ides) of the Roman month of March. Neither calendar years nor consular years match exactly with Julian years at any point before Caesar's reform, because Roman calendar years in the late republic were only

[1] Varro placed the foundation of Rome in the third year of the sixth Olympiad (see Atticus 33 F2, comm. for Atticus' possible contribution to this scheme), i.e. during the period which ran from a certain point in the summer of 754 BC to a similar point in the summer of 753 BC. Since Varro treated Rome's birthday as falling on the Parilia, the 21st day of the Roman month of April, and since April was clearly regarded as a spring month (regardless of the exact relationship of the Roman month of April to the seasonal year), it is clear that Varro conceived of the foundation of Rome as taking place in the spring of 753 BC.

355 days long, with extra days being added on an irregular basis by the pontifices through intercalation. So what we mean by '153 BC' here and in other cases where we refer to this year in which Q. Fulvius Nobilior and T. Annius Luscus were consuls is not the retrojected Julian year 153 BC, but the Roman consular (and calendar) year most closely approximating to the retrojected Julian year 153 BC. This is the case for all republican dates before 45 BC. For dates before 153 BC it is almost always the consular rather than the calendar year by which we date, and in general we refer to the consular year except where otherwise stated.[2]

There were years in which the eponymous officials were not consuls (e.g. when they were consular tribunes), but for convenience we use 'consular years' here to refer to such years also. For the period 509 BC to 301 BC, 'Varr.' usually appears after the date. This indicates that we are giving the date on the chronological scheme usually attributed to Varro, under which the foundation of the republic was placed in 509 BC, the period 375–371 was treated as a five-year period of anarchy, and four 'dictator years' were inserted, namely 333, 324, 309, and 301. When we place 'Varr.' after a date in the period 509 BC to 301 BC, this means that we are referring to the consular year which *on the Varronian chronological scheme for the republican period* most closely approximates to the retrojected Julian year which bears that number. The use of a Varronian date in this way should therefore not be taken to mean that we believe that the events in question, if they happened at all, happened in the Julian year which bears the same number. Sometimes, however, we do not use 'Varr.' for a consular year in this period—for example, when an event is dated by a different chronological scheme from the Varronian (e.g. '507 BC' for the first year of the republic in Piso 9 F29, comm.). For the Varronian period of anarchy (375–371 BC Varr.), when by definition there were no consuls (or their equivalent), the dates may be considered to refer to five seasonal years in between the consular years 376 BC Varr. and 370 BC Varr.

Since dates for events in Roman history are often given by Greek authors who used years which ran from a point in summer to a similar point in the next summer (e.g. Olympiad years), dates are sometimes given in the form '748/7' BC to reflect the Greek origin of the information in question or to give the date for convenience in a form which corresponds to an Olympiad year.

(MPP)

[2] Exceptions are, for example, 'Julian year' in *Annales Maximi* F5 comm.; 'calendar year' in Piso 9 F38 comm. On those rare occasions when we are dating by the Roman calendar year rather than the consular year and refer to '158 BC', this means of course the Roman calendar year which most closely approximates to the retrojected Julian year 158 BC.